

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 1125 Date 1/7 Judge Mills School Sheb. South

Aff Team/Code <u>West Bend</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Mukwonago</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>Alex Kopish</u></td> <td><u>27.5</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Emma Sanborn</u></td> <td><u>27.5</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Alex Kopish</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Emma Sanborn</u>	<u>27.5</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><u>Brynne Reilly</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Andrew Patterson</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Alex Kopish</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Emma Sanborn</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 You should both do a better job extending and impacting your aff. Don't read new IAR cards unless they answer something new from the ~~2AR~~ block.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 The underview at the bottom of the INR is unnecessary: you can use the time to read more cards

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 Don't explain your cards right after reading them, it's not necessary and a waste of speech time.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Do impact comparison in 2NR

Reasons for Decision:

Both teams should do more impact comparison in the 2NR/2AR (although you are already doing a good job for novices)

2AR - cite more specific pieces of evidence

2NR - does better evidence comparison, wins pretty substantial risk of case defense

aff doesn't answer space debns turns case

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1/7 Judge Cooper Herdel School Brinckwood

Aff Team/Code <u>Janesville</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 style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Brandon Reed</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>20</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Davis Kunkel</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>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Davis Kunkel</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>Andrew Ranczik</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> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Tej Bindra</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>25</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Andrew Ranczik</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Tej Bindra</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Davis Kunkel</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Andrew Ranczik</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Tej Bindra</u>	<u>25</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<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 Shouldn't stand so far if you're going to speak quietly. A lot of what you said I couldn't hear and didn't flow.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 You speak well, but could use a little more structure to improve things

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 A lot of your evidence was chosen based on tags, not content. (over) a problem. Most of what you said didn't counter their evidence

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Enjoyed your analytics, but you need to speak more dynamically.

Reasons for Decision:

50 I said I would be judging stocks. Aff advs and Neg DAs aren't going to outweigh. Aff didn't focus the case properly. Aff argued no harms. You started out losing the round without saying why your plan is useful. Your advantages can imply harms, but none of your advantages were unique, as noted by the neg.

Aff had no harms or solvency, thus I negate.

Sig Harms  
 Inherency  
 Plan/Topicality  
 Solvency

}

Not present.

Neg: Solv  
 Harms  
 Inherency

Aff: Top

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 1129 Date 1-7-12 Judge Oswald School Homestead

Aff Team/Code <u>Appleton East Aff</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><u>Michael Anderson</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</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>Michael Anderson</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</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>Asif Sadik</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Michael Cronst</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Michael Cronst</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Michael Anderson</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Molly Courtney</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Michael Cronst</u>	<u>28</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 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 well organized IAC, but try not to rock back + forth. Also, try to make eye contact with judge while reading your cards not just when interpreting your cards. Once an argument is dropped (rejection), you can't bring it up in rebuttal.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 Really good IAC, Excellent analytic arguments. Well said and linked arguments regarding OST. Weighed the round nicely in the rebuttal.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 India relations argument was erroneous at best in 2AC. There was 1:33 left on clock for your constructive. Use all of your time. If you go thru all your cards, argue analytics. Make sure you use reputable sources for your evidence (such as technical journals).

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Good extensions of your arguments. Excellent analytics. Try not to rock while you speak.

Reasons for Decision:  
 While extinction may be the greatest impact, if you don't solve for extinction, your impact can't pull the round. The neg team proved to me that the problems associated with trying to live in space put the probability of success at nearly zero.  
 Negs win.

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 1126 Date 1/7/12 Judge Olson, Matt School Appleton East

Aff Team/Code <u>Rhineland</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Janesville Patter</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Torden Kester</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Dylan Wendt</u></td> <td><u>26.5</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Torden Kester</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Samuel Schendel</u></td> <td><u><del>25</del> 27</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Crystal Flores</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u><del>25</del> 27</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Crystal Flores</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Torden Kester</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u><del>25</del> 27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Crystal Flores</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
Good Case, Good IAR.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
- Good INR Analysis on the DA

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
Dont Hug Your Partners ~~Cross-X~~  
- You are not understanding the Unilateralism Argument.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
Make sure that you understand the Warrants of your Arguments

Reasons for Decision:

- Everyone Needs to speak louder.  
\* THE NEGS DID NOT RUN A COUNTER PLAN \*  
- ZAR CONCEDES THE DISADS/IMPACTS, ZAR EXTENDS THEM.  
I VOTE AFF ON RISK OF EXTINCTION.

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 1132 Date 11/7/16 Judge Kretzel School West Bend

Aff Team/Code <u>Aff 2 - Rhinelander</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Muskego</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>26</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Stephanie Belanger</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(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><u>Harrison Wendland</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Willa Tsao</u></td> <td><u>24</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Harrison Wendland</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Willa Tsao</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Harrison Wendland</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Willa Tsao</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 1MR pick the strongest positions and focus on them. You shouldn't really read cards. Stick to extending cards & analyzing.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 Make sure 1MR refutes 1AC directly whenever possible.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 Do more in 2AC than read cards. Refute, analyze and attack 1MR. You need to read cards @ the same time as the top. What you do is really confusing.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Reading extensions is fine, but you need to answer the 2AC refutation too.

Reasons for Decision:  
 By this point in the season, I'd hope to hear more clash and refutation. It's tough to wade through the arguments and figure out who deserves the win.  
 In the end, 2MR goes for solvency of the moon base, goat problems, disease and the rest of the case attacks. The problem is that 2AC answers it and the neg rebuttals fail to offer compelling reasons for me to extend their defense.  
 The DA is really undercovered by 2MR. If it's covered more, the negs might get the ballot. but with a conceded Link Turn, it goes away completely for the negs, leaving an Aff decision.

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Novice Round 2 Room 1128 Date 1/7/12 Judge Willina Melay School Rufus King

Aff Team/Code <u>Homestead</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>West Bend</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Sean Zacharias</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Mark Usatinsky</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Sean Zacharias</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Mark Usatinsky</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Becca Graven</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Timothy Pittz</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Becca Graven</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Timothy Pittz</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Sean Zacharias</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Mark Usatinsky</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Becca Graven</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Timothy Pittz</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 Nice 1AC, you had some time left you can add more. Please number each card in each contention.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 You need to work on sign posting. Let me know where the cards go on the flow. Read all dates, tags, and authors. You had 2 mins left you could just read more.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 Microvoice, presentation, organization, and delivery.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 you need to make sure you read all primary tags, authors, and dates to a card. You need to prove your arguments using the evidence you have. Don't make things up.

**Reasons for Decision:**

- ① → this argument was pointless. Negs end up dropping it, but you don't argue the card correctly. Does the NAWO do what their plan already does? Explain that.
- ② → Negs don't read their authors + dates so it's hard for me to make comparisons. AFF's extend piece 10 + NASA II which describe what plan solves for. Neg doesn't put enough on sollemancy.
- ③ → The impacts the Econ, neg, and Nuclear Advantages go unanswered. There's no reason not to vote for plan if there are impacts that will happen if I don't.

Note! The GST should not be on Inherence, it should be its own case + and weigh it against case.

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 124 Date 1/7/12 Judge K. Gamberdinger School West Bend

Aff Team/Code Mukwanago

Neg Team/Code Appleton East

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Sophia Dolan</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Myra Medina</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Justin Struebing</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff

- you could speak a little slower in your first speech
- your other speeches were well organized

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg

- ~~you~~ use all your time in speeches + CX and be more prepared for both
- also it wasn't open CX

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff

- great final speech
- excellent job in your speeches and CX

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg

- speak louder- you are hard to understand
- use all your time in speeches + CX and prepare more for them

Reasons for Decision:

I am voting AFF in this round since they presented a solid plan including cost, timeline, effectiveness, need, advantages, and EDDE research. The Neg team brought up some decent arguments such as it not really being a threat, the space treaty, satellites burning up in the atmosphere, international debris guidelines, and problems with EDDE but fail to explain them ~~on~~ well and support with real evidence cards. Also neg spent a lot of time on Russia's pod round which I did not find very topical in the round.

