

Room: 329  
 Start: 8:00  
 Varsity Public Forum (Regis LS vs. Bronx Science PR)

Moscariolo, Diane  
**3 Wadhwa, Dominique**

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Regis LS Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Bronx Science PR Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> <u>3</u> for Francis Leong	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>2</u> <u>25</u> for Victoria Pavlov
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> <u>1</u> for Ferdinand Suba	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>4</u> <u>25</u> for Mahmudur Rahman

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Ferdinand - excellent cross x skills; Good job during Grand Cross supporting your partner  
Francis - beneficial to the economy? develop that more  
 Good job w/ rebuttal - clear & organized; Good job bringing cross x conversation back to point

Comments to Debaters:

Victoria - you had a good response re coming here to have babies - you should have the quote available - it would be more convincing; Develop the stat about how many women come to have babies  
Mahmudur - Develop the point that welfare funds would be better allocated if birthrite cit were abolished  
~~or~~ show how \$56 bil is saved or better allocated. Your Final Focus needs to be more specific

These are the reasons for my decision:

The con team demonstrated that abolishing birthrite citizenship would create an underclass of unauthorized citizens and ultimately cost the US both in \$\$ and in social capital.

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: D. Moscarolo 2/4/12 Montuella

Room: 328

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Capitol Debate MM vs. Freehold Township HM)

3

Leong, Fina

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Capitol Debate MM Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Freehold Township HM Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Luke Musimi	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Naeem Hossain
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Luke Musimi	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Yash Mirchandani

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

The team that won this debate is Capitol Debate representing the PRO CON

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Luke: good contentions with good explanations on the issues brought forward. Also supported arguments with facts and refs. Counter argument were on points

Comments to Debaters:

Naeem: Overall good contentions with appropriate explanations. your contention on Birthright Citizenship not supported by Constitution - a bit weak.

Yash: Overall good support of argument.

Focus on covering more ground and not just sticking to one point to make your case

These are the reasons for my decision:

Overall the con contentions and arguments were stronger as were the rebuttals.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
 Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

*Resolution: Birthright Citizenship should be abolished in the U.S.A.*

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: Ridge DK Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Karn Dalal **2**  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Nikhil Kapadia **4**

Team: Freehold Township DC Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Samantha Damito **1**  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Sameera Chaudhry **3**

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

The team that won this debate is FREEHOLD TOWNSHIP DC representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

*Sp. 2. Raised a good point in the alternative the great workers program but did not did not present a persuasive justification as an alternative to the constitutional 14th Amendment and did explain well why it is a better alternative.  
 Sp. 4 did not explain the relevance of the 'checks & balance' argument to justify abolishing the birthright citizenship. There was poor articulation of the cumulative GDP increases when BR citizenship is abolished.*

*Sp. 1 presented well organized and structured constructive inquiry particularly the constitutional basis to abolish. Provided compelling argument on the effect on kids who are not affected but will be affected if birthright citizenship is abolished.  
 Sp. 3 - Very sharp in the cross fire making a good rebuttal on the PRO's argument on great worker's program alternative. Made a good point in connecting right to life liberty & pursuit of happiness to the CON position in not abolishing BR citizenship.*

These are the reasons for my decision:

*The CON won this debate because they presented better arguments and provided more compelling data and study to negate the abolishment of the birthright citizenship. The CON made more convincing arguments regarding the positive effects of birthright citizenship to the U.S. economy.*

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

*[Handwritten Signature]*

*REGIS*

*2/4/2012*

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	

*not abolishing BR citizenship*

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Delbarton CG Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Michael Cuppari 4  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Kevin Godart 2

Team: Regis HaSo Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for DuMichel Harley 1  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Sean Sonnemann 3

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

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

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Kevin: Good flow + enunciation - good job establishing the flow in your case - always helps to direct where the debate is going. I ~~thought~~ thought your points were good in being able to touch upon the 4 necessities of debate: claim, warrant, link, + impact. Good job in CX. Excellent summary - good job providing voting issues. Definitely Extended "can't serve in army + jury", \$113 billion on taxpayers, could save that money through abolishing, and Neg doesn't show numbers

Michael: Great flow + enunciation - although you may not have known this, you did spread your opp. - Great, your responses gave great warrants, links, and impacts. Great job completely negotiating their C2. These are the reasons for my decision: by pointing out their complete lack of evidence in their claim. Your Pew Research criticism was great, and bringing up UTex was great b/c the empirics were more solid. Your causal link b/w BC and illegal immigration was tenuous at first but was fully solidified in your case. Great! Also good job backing up "not fully subject to jurisdiction" point.

ORAL RFD

Comments to Debaters:

DuMichel: Great flow + enunciation, well constructed case in many aspects, but some parts lacked warranting evidence - there are 4 necessities including: claim, warrant, link, and impact. Your claims were there but sometimes your warrants, links, and impacts were either a) tenuous or b) just not there at all. Be wary of not having the steps after making the claim - it makes arguments hard to buy, particularly ~~your~~ the context of your C2 + C3. Good job in CX. In your summary, I was looking for you to give voting issues and what round was coming down to, whereas you merely provide a rehashing of arguments you and your partner already made - no voting issues means I don't know where to focus in your points.

Sean: Good flow + enunciation, you had good responses to the things your opponents were saying, but for the most part they weren't warranted. Without warrants, you cannot link and cannot create impacts. This is a glaring error in your debate. However, I did buy your point that ~~the~~ the cons. is not designed to have the same implication as history. Good job in CX.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

*Jude A. Tungul - Montville*

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Ridge SC Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Allison Shim  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Ben Choi

Team: Delbarton AR Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for August Atencio  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Braeden Reinoso

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

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

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters: *Overall good contentions.*  
 Allison: *Slow down a bit. good explaining of topics*  
 Ben: *contentions supported by ~~arg~~ facts ✓*

Comments to Debaters: *Overall good contentions*  
 August: *slow down a bit conclusions flowed from evidence ✓*  
 Braeden: *effectively countered arguments of opponents. crossfire answers on point ✓*

These are the reasons for my decision:

*The Con side had strong counter arguments as indicated by their exhaustive evidence*

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: *Fina Leong & Parris University Lecturer*

Room: 335

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Cypress Bay KK vs. Capitol Debate CR)

3

Zhang, Harry

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Cypress Bay KK Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Capitol Debate CR Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>25</u> for Chad Klitzman 4	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Rhea Chitaki 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Sami Klitzman 2	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Meera Rothman 3

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

The team that won this debate is Cypress Bay KK representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

SP2 presentation need to be improved, read too much with out looking at audience, fast too. Good points about outsourcing

SP4 Good presentation throughout. Good points about documentation citizen tests etc.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Overall Cypress bring more points and relevance. such as. children's welfare. Consumer goods. economic effects.

Comments to Debaters:

SP1. Good start of the presentation. Should look your audience more. Good points about naturalization, illegal immigrants and government funding.

SP3. Good presentation throughout. Good points about us responsibility vs. national debts. Employment oppo. for us citizens. Earned vs. auto-granted. Good points about defending alternative solutions.

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:

Harry Zhang

However, should attack opponents points more.

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Regis ChKi Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Richard Chian/  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Teddy Kim 3

Team: Ridge JY Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Robert Ju 2  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Kevin Yang 4

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

SP1. Should look your audience more.  
 • time control is good  
 • Good point about root cause  
 • Interrupted too much.

SP 2. Good presentation throughout  
 Good points about crime terrorists.

SP 3 Good presentation. good points about financial benefits education.  
 contribution we withdraw benefits.  
 these are the reasons for my decision.

SP 4 Good presentation, good point about government funding frequency vs. major trade.

Ridge JY should not take carry separate conversation during final focus.  
 overall performed better. solid evidence.  
 good rebuttal during cross fire.

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: Harry Zhang

NEWARK INVITATIONAL  
 Science Park HS  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Ridge CT Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Sean Conway (2)  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Avinash Tamby (4)

Team: Regis DE Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): ~~28~~ 29 for Nick Duva (3)  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for James Elustondo (1)

PRO

27

29-30 Outstanding  
 27-28 Above Average  
 24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

29

CON

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

Comments to Debaters:

Sean: Good articulation.

Avinash: Dynamic arguments and well presented.

Ridge can be more forceful in their argument.

Comments to Debaters:

James Well prepared & presented = 4.

Nick Good use of time. Good counter-arguments & context aware. Good eye contact.

These are the reasons for my decision:

CF<sub>1</sub> - Regis was forceful in their arguments.  
 CF<sub>2</sub> - ~~and stated~~ Both teams ~~that~~ presented their cases well.  
 GCF -

One of the ~~are~~ "facts" that Ridge ~~stated~~ stated was not true. No patient can be turned away from ER room & hence illegal immigrants

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

21 + 29 = 50

43 + 1:17

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	

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
 Science Park HS  
 Feb 3-4, 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.

PLEASE DO NOT FILL OUT THIS BALLOT UNTIL AFTER THE COIN TOSS HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND THE DEBATERS HAVE DETERMINED SIDE/SPEAKING ORDER

Team: Capitol Debate Circle Side: Pro  Con   
 Speaker 1 Name: Akash Pulluru 19  
 Speaker 3 Name: Rosey Payne 27

Team: Regis Ba Ri Circle Side: Pro  Con   
 Speaker 2 Name: John Balletta 30  
 Speaker 4 Name: Patrick Rice 28

Team Points \_\_\_\_\_

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

Team Points \_\_\_\_\_

The team that won this debate is Regis Ba Ri representing the PRO  CON   
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Comments to Debaters:

Sp1 was asking for plan for dealing  
 w births? asked 2x what plan there  
 would be - in x fire.

Sp3 Pay into but no cost (ill immigrants)  
 & also not held. Illegals cannot be  
 employed as SP4 pointed out & sales tax  
 < income tax.

Sp1 argument on more knowledgeable  
 voting populace. Good pt on P. 4b  
 & out link on how it was determined.

SP3 pt on non-earned citizenship does not  
 hold ~~weight~~ applicat + only illegals  
 These are the reasons for my decision:

Although the Pro side's arguments were emotional there  
 was very little data to substantiate arguments.  
 Con was able to defeat each point by showing  
 lack of links & extension.

Comments to Debaters:

Sp2 Excellent pace & eye contact  
 points on registry & cost held  
 Very good pace, volume & demeanor.  
 Made pts well, addressed flow and  
 gave data.

SP4 good pt on no backup for  
 statements made on education  
 & better voters. Pace was a little  
 fast. Good eye contact.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
 Science Park HS  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Ridge CM Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis HM Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Catherine Chen 4	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Tim Hannan 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Sunjay Melkote 2	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Vincent Monti 1

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Sunjay cost benefit analysis well presented. Increased depreciation = increased costs. ~~was~~ well spoken in cross fire  
 Catherine  
 Labeling is different but result is the same was well argued. Good responses in grand crossfire

Comments to Debaters:

Vincent defined your terms well. Cost benefit analysis was well rebutted but didn't quite overturn it.  
 Tim  
 Excellent speaker. Response in cross fire rounds were excellent. As for an alternative advocs given one.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Both sides did an excellent job, but I believe that Ridge won because there arguments in favor of alternatives and economic costs and ~~cost~~ benefits were subtle

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]

Room: 339

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Regis PP vs. Delbarton EM)

3

Chikis, Jeffery

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Regis PP Circle Side: Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con	Team: Delbarton EM Circle Side: <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Christian Pavlakos 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for George Easley 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Alex Petrillo 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>30</u> for Michael Mumma 4

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

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

Low Point Win? ( Yes)  No )

Comments to Debaters:  
 George Excellent presentation. Constitutional argument was well made. Economic argument was well made.  
 Michael Excellent speaker, very confident. Birthright lets then sponsors others is well spoken.

Comments to Debaters:  
 Christian ~~Pro~~ bureaucracy argument well made. Increase in costs well played. Crossfire was excellent.  
 Alex Both legal and illegal birthright not an economic incentive well rebutted.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I believe this is probably the best debate I have judged as yet. Both sides did an excellent job. But I have to pick a winner and I pick Regis 5y1 hair because they answered our arguments just slightly better.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Jeff Chikis

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	

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
**Feb 3-4, 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: Ridge LS Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis BiPo Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Michelle Lu 2	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Joseph Bianco 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Deeptanshu Singhvi 4	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28.5</u> for Douglas Powers 3

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Michelle: Good flow + enunciation, solid case, well constructed and definitely tapped upon the 4 necessities of debate: claim, warrant, link, and impact. I definitely liked how you specified the direct impact you make per contention, particularly in your C3. ~~Good~~ Great job in CX. Your summary was great, definitely picked up your solvency stance ("solves for underclass"). <sup>also</sup> I bought your extensions of increased ill. imm., 42% decrease in crime, and haven't logically been able to prove.

Deeptanshu: Great flow + enunciation - excellent reinforcement of your f/w for the round, definitely strengthened all the arguments. Having a solvency framework was super effective on the part of your arguments, definitely had a hand on regis arguments. <sup>These are the reasons for my decision:</sup> Your warrants were excellent. I really liked your "not a long term impact" arg. against their C2, definitely had a huge impact in the round. Also, I definitely thought your "causal impact" argument was excellent - linked back the flow and resolution, and plus you solidified the point in your final focus.

In the end, I @ extend 3 points both on aff and neg:  
 Aff  
 2nd example  
 C3  
 Under. benefits  
 Neg  
 2 links - positive correlation  
 Underclass ~~benefit~~ - Poland & Bulgaria  
 Causal Impacts.

Comments to Debaters:

Joe: Good flow + enunciation, solid case - had great evidence + well constructed points - touched upon all 4 necessities of debate: claim, warrant, link, and impact. Your point on infeasibility was definitely something I picked up on - gets at the heart of the debate that this is a debate on domestic policy and whether or not abolishing EC is something that gov't. should do. Good job in CX. In your summary, it was good that you extended infeasibility and how you point out increased illegal imm. through abolishing.

Douglas: Good flow + enunciation - your sign posting is great I was definitely able to follow where all your arguments followed. From your Rebuttal I really liked that you pointed out the prediction of Aff's arguments were rather weak in some aspects. It was also good how you CX'd your studies from CI and your Germany example, great warrant for the "underclass" benefits. Good job in CX. Your final focus was very good, definitely pointed out what to extend - Extended your 2nd example point - C3

But at the point where Neg's C3 is unwarranted for the most part and Aff provides solvency @ in their world. I affirm.

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: Jude Tungul - Montville

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
 Science Park HS  
 Feb 3-4, 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.

PLEASE DO NOT FILL OUT THIS BALLOT UNTIL AFTER THE COIN TOSS HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND THE DEBATERS HAVE DETERMINED SIDE/SPEAKING ORDER

Team: Princeton BS Circle Side: Pro  Con  
 Speaker 1 Name: Betsy Studholm 29  
 Speaker 3 Name: Dana Barry 28

Team: Regis DePo Circle Side:  Pro  Con  
 Speaker 2 Name: Tom DeMazo 27  
 Speaker 4 Name: Christian Powers 27

Team Points 28.5

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

Team Points 27

The team that won this debate is Princeton BS representing the PRO  CON

Comments to Debaters:

*Sp1 Excellent pace & eye contact  
 Good original contentions but did drop bureaucracy & underclass pts  
 Excellent pt bringing up interpretations that included illegals  
 Sp1 lost some links during cross  
 Good pt on not est links to ↑ in crime  
 Good pt about skewing %'s,*

Comments to Debaters:

*~~Team~~  
 No links estab. between ↑ crime & illegals  
 Sp4 lacked eye contact, pace very fast  
 Good pt about  
 Problem contradicted own pt that #1 ruling of 14<sup>th</sup> Am. did not include immigrants but then that we must change ideas <sup>of immig.</sup> since 1800's differ from today.*

These are the reasons for my decision:

*Con side was able to uphold links, establish data and keep argument consistent.*

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	

NEWARK INVITATIONAL  
 Science Park HS  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Regis KI Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> <u>Con</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Alex Kane <u>4</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Arthur Imperatore <u>3</u>	Team: Bronx Science AA Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> <u>Con</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Elena Anderson <u>3</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Margarita Artoglou <u>1</u>
---	---

28

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

27

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

PRO

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

CON

Comments to Debaters:

1 Arthur: Well quoted, good references > 4 min.

2 Alex Prof "Name" is Alaska? Good counter pts.

Comments to Debaters:

Margarita: Get good facts. Good references, examples. ~~Be to~~ Minimize "Ah"s.

Elena More men > women coming. = 4 min.

These are the reasons for my decision:

CF2 - EA stated opinions, not facts (Turks, Germany)  
 The PRO team made good use of their PREP time & dynamically ~~came~~ came up w/ arguments & countered their opponents.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

23 + 40 + 14

Room: 326

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Bronx Science RS vs. Capitol Debate CM)

3

Duva, Nicholas

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Bronx Science RS Circle Side: Pro  Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Michael Raevsky

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Joe Salmaggi

Team: Capitol Debate CM Circle Side:  Pro  Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Julia Conley

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Anjali Mahadevia

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

The team that won this debate is CAPITOL DEBATE CM representing the  PRO  CON

Low Point Win? ( Yes  No  )

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

PRO presented effective, evidence based contentions not refuted sufficiently by CON. CON responses were anecdotal, and depended on an undefined "framework" rather than evidence equal to that presented by PRO. PRO presented strong case that illegal immigration would not increase.

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] REGIS H.S.

Room: 326

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Freehold Township NK vs. Ridge GS)

3

Duva, Nicholas

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Freehold Township NK Circle Side: Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Team: Ridge GS Circle Side: Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Irving Nestor <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Davis George <input checked="" type="radio"/>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Mahaksh Kotdawala <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Saloni Singhvi <input checked="" type="radio"/>

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

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

Low Point Win? ( Yes  No  )

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

PRO presented very effective cost/benefit argument not fully refuted by CON. Evidence was clear and extensive. "Net cost" of illegal immigration was compelling and connected clearly to BC. CON position that BC should not be abolished because it's now legal and has not been challenged seemed unreasonable & was refuted 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:

*[Signature]* REBIS H.S.

Room: 317

Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Delbarton AzRy vs. Capitol Debate BR)

3

King, George

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Delbarton AzRy Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Kabbas Azhar 4  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Conor Ryan 2

Team: Capitol Debate BR Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Griffin Badalamante 1  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Raja Ramesh 3

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

The team that won this debate is Delbarton AzRy representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Citizenship is right for Americas  
 14 Am has worked since 1867  
 No BC ~~increases~~ increases IIT numbers  
 People born in USA will become "Stateless" with consequences of trafficking and prostitution  
 87% of all births in US would be deemed non-citizens w/o BC

Comments to Debaters:

abolish BC for everyone  
 Civillians  
 Citizens - vote + run for office  
 age 18 - test or service to become Citizens  
 "ignorant people should not vote" or run for office

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro sets out a proposal for a new "voting citizen" ~~class~~ classification that is based on knowledge or service. Hence CON's arguement about citizenship as a right per se 14 Am was not addressed. Also, the topic of "stateless" people was a very big topic that was not addressed. The "concrete harms" arguements of Con were very crypt

### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark King

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
 Feb 3-4, 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: Ridge OW Circle Side: Pro <b>Con</b>	Team: Bronx Science HR Circle Side: <b>Pro</b> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Tim O'Shea 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Nusrat Hossain 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Ankit Wadhwa 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Felix Rozenberg 4

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

The team that won this debate is Pro / Bronx Science HR representing the **PRO** CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
 Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

Utilitarianism arguents  
 "benefits outweigh costs"  
 arguents depend 100% on facts and the facts used to argue utilitarianism

utilitarian arguents  
 deontology arguents in speaker 2  
 fairness arguents to Americans throughout

tie all **(+)**  
 to be ruled in **(BC)**

These are the reasons for my decision:

As I told you both, very well argued. In the end, the utilitarian arguents cancelled out. Two things favored Pro:

- Con relied on Immigration Statistics as a whole to justify BC arguents, which is a smaller slice of I as a whole
- the deontology arguents of Pro were dropped by 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 prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Deon King

Room: 329  
Start: 8:00

Varsity Public Forum (Hunter College CK vs. Regis CO)

Moscarifolo, Diane  
**3 Wadhwa, Dominique**

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 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: Hunter College CK Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis CO Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Karen Chen	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Jaime Cobham
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Ilana Kaufman	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Jack O'Malley

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Karen - Develop support for testing people @ age 18 and how that can be accomplished. Not sure that taking a test will GUARANTEE an able voting body.  
Ilana Strong rebuttal skills! we should fix our immigration system; good job w/showing how we can make our govt more stable by improving the way we deal w/immigration

Comments to Debaters:

Jaime Clear well delivered 1st speech. Be careful with generalizations. Don't assume things like "voting tax" presents the issue.  
Jack Good job of HOW the testing will actually happen. Develop the benefit of attending US schools in order to create a more informed citizenry and keep linking it to birthrite citizenship

These are the reasons for my decision:

The Con team successfully argued that Birthrite citizenship should not be abolished because abolishing won't solve the immigration crisis and won't deter immigration. Birthrite citizenship gives children of immigrants benefits that also extend the society as a whole.

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: Duo-catoe Montelup