

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 DK Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Bronx Science RS Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Karn Dalal 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Michael Raevsky 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Nikhil Kapadia 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Joe Salmaggi 2

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

SP1. Good presentation time control and statistics. Well in crossfire

SP3. Good rebuttal, payback, outweigh burden and 100,000 deportations.

Grand Crossfire: more focused final: stated larger issues such as economic impact and society impact.
 These are the reasons for my decision:

Overall Ridge DK stayed more focused, good questions during crossfire. Good rebuttal too.

Comments to Debaters:

SP2. ^{my} Good defining terms - right at beginning. Good statistics about economic impact. Enthusiasm about subject summary. Have repetitive facts and statistics.

SP4. Need improvement in presentation. Final focus is good in Net benefit. unequal distribution of burden.

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 GS Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis ChKi Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Davis George 2	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Richard Chian 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Saloni Singhvi 4	Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 <u>30</u> for Teddy Kim 3

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Also amazing speakers!!


Comments to Debaters:

Amazing speakers!!

NOT much of a critique on the round,
it was an amazing round!!

These are the reasons for my decision: ^{affirmative} The arguments posed by the ~~negative~~ ^{negative} team showing how under both the pro & con world, those lose would still be there, making the entire affirmative case to fall.

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: 

Room: 339
 Start: 1:00
 Varsity Public Forum (Regis BiPo vs. Princeton BS)

5 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 BiPo Circle Side: Pro Con Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Joseph Bianco Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Douglas Powers	Team: Princeton BS Circle Side: Pro Con Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Dana Barry Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Betsy Studholme
---	---

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Joe, sometimes you don't enunciate clearly and your argument gets lost.

Doug, your delivery is great - you are collected & eloquent - this is impressive -

Team your arguments need to be more structured -

These are the reasons for my decision:

Both teams did a great job - However Princeton offered more believable evidence and reasoning -

Comments to Debaters:

Betsy, good speech; effective delivery during crossfire - your 3rd claim needs more work

Dana, I like your arguments. Please work on enhancing the quality of your rebuttal -

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:

Wadhwa

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

Team: Delbarton AzRy Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Kabbas Azhar 3
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Conor Ryan 1

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:

Robert: Excellent flow and enunciation, excellent case - had all 4 necessities of debate covered through and through (claim, warrant, link, impact). Your 65% costs more than benefits was excellent, as well as your point on decreasing national income. Those most jumped out to me but your warrants were all excellent. Great job in CX. Great summary, definitely picked up backlog argument, welfare leeching, increased wages, decreased crime, \$113 bil cost.

Kevin: Excellent flow & enunciation - excellent rebuttal - great responses to neg case; definitely bought flow response, 2 logical warrants argument, the fact that aff needed to quantify the increase in underclass, and that statelessness is merely a misconception. Great job analyzing and seeing that practicality isn't important given the ~~serious~~ implications of the resolution. Good job extending responses to underclass.

Very close debate, excellent job by everyone; In the end I affirm b/c aff proves that the status quo of society could be better without BC. While I did seriously take into consideration that Neg proved a correlation with economic incentives, backlog, welfare leeching, increased wages, decreased crime and \$113 bil. cost all outweighed. I also bought neg's argument that Aff's terrorism point lacked a causal link, but that didn't negate the other points.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Jude Tungul - Montville

Comments to Debaters:

Conor: ~~Excellent~~ Excellent flow and enunciation, excellent case - had all 4 necessities of debate covered through and through (claim, warrant, link, and impact). Your CB was excellently developed - other teams have tried to use this point, but they have not executed it as well as you have. Great warrants and great comparison using Dom Rep. Good job in CX. Great summary, really liked extension of your correlation evidence, that deportations happen anyways and no link for their C2 (terrorism).

Kabbas: Excellent flow & enunciation - excellent rebuttal - had major responses to Aff case. Definitely bought correlation of drop after recession, your Coleman v. US case, and linking citizenship v. BC and assumption of impact as for as their terrorism impact went. Also great job establishing causal link framework.

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 HM Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Tim Hannan 3
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Vincent Monti 1

Team: Freehold Township HM Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Naeem Hossain 2
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Yash Mirchandani 4

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

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

Comments to Debaters:

Vincent: Decent flow, needs work on enunciation - some of your words mashed together but it didn't fully detract from my understanding of your case. Good case, lacked explicit impacts but did give 3/4 necessities: claim, warrant, link. Your impacts need work but that doesn't mean they were completely non-existent. Good job in your summary on ~~the~~ looking towards the Supreme Court, saying that Aff provides no solvency, children should not be punished for something their parents did, and that these ppl are still under US jurisdiction.

Tim: Great flow + enunciation; good rebuttal, had great responses and sign posted well. Helped me to follow in what direction you were taking your arguments. Good job pointing out the tangential characteristics of their case (illegal immigrant impacts). Nice bringing up Kim Jong Un. These are the reasons for my decision:
 v. US case. Also good how you pointed out that Aff hasn't shown the statistics for how many ppl are breaking these laws.

Comments to Debaters:

Naeem: Good flow + enunciation. The strength of your case started off high, but severely deteriorated by the end. The necessities of debate are as follows - claim, warrant, link, and impact, all in that order. Your C3 + C4 had no warrants, so you could not make the links and impacts. Thus I don't buy C3 + C4 in your case.

US jurisdiction.

Yash: Good flow + enunciation, had ^{some} good points in your rebuttal. But many of the things you said were tangential and had ~~no~~ true connection to the resolution. For example your answers to their instability point had neither empirical nor logical warrants, so it was hard to buy.

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	

ORAL RFD. I negate b/c of better warrants and justifications.

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.

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)

2ND

1ST

Team: Regis LS Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Francis Leong 4
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Ferdinand Suba 2

Team: Delbarton EM Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for George Easley 1
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Michael Mumma 3

1/8 36

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

1/5
55

↳ HANOU OPO CV
well

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

WATCH OUT FOR RHETORICAL IMPACTS
 "These people", illegals = Mexicans Alone
 etc. by your examples.
 Woo, woo, woo, No No No - AN ODD AFFECTATION IN CX
 Yelling in CX doesn't make the
 Arg true.

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

The pro asks me to compare a world with brc with a world without - seems the German example would be the best way to do this. It is first world. In Australia etc, dealing w/an ethnic minority infusion. The world was clearly better w/con side.
 Mothers v. workers - the sheer dts still go con. Even if some come to get coverage (lyg later), they would still have the incentive to come for job stability. The social impact of a permanent unclass also goes con.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4min
Speaker 2	4min
Crossfire (1&2)	3min
Speaker 3	4min
Speaker 4	4min
Crossfire (3&4)	3min
Speaker 1 Summary	2min
Speaker 2 Summary	2min
Grand Crossfire (All)	4min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Lynne Coyne

Room: 330

Start: 1:00

Varsity Public Forum (Ridge CT vs. Bronx Science HR)

5

Chikis, Jeffery

Smith, Elijah

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 ^{2nd}
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Sean Conway
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Avinash Tamby

Team: Bronx Science HR Circle Side: Pro Con ^{1st}
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Nusrat Hossain
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Felix Rozenberg

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

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Ancho babies ~~is~~ Politically correct
 your arg assumes fiat power. you can't say reforms will happen if someone doesn't do it.
 no! too cost. what do you fix w/ saved \$? what gets better? what gets worse?

Comments to Debaters:

if c/p's are allowed, do I reject the arg on the team? Tell me (and I would have voted on that if it was more developed.)

These are the reasons for my decision:

- underclass is not non-unique.
- ① Pro allows team to get bashed more.
- ② Pro goes for \$1 but doesn't compare savings w/ ①. It.

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: E. Smith

③ \$ allowed access to c/p net benefit. \$ in decision.

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: Regis DePo Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Luke Musimi ¹	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Tom DeMarzo ²
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u> </u> for Luke Musimi	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Christian Powers ⁴

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

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

(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Concentrate on time allocation.

- Look up and speak @ me, not the laptop.

- good cross-fire w/ the definition of BRC.

Comments to Debaters:

your representations of undocumented people of color are ferocious. (vident law breakers?)

you group them, essentialize them, and then ignore a lot of particularities.

Anchor babies? That's not a PC term.

Focus more on accessing equality in your speech. Prove you increase it institutionally.

you don't have an impact right now by how you explain it.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Luke's Summary gave me a F/W to evaluate the debate, while the Pro didn't. I should understand that no circumstances can be taken into account and that would lead to some stateless children, even if the pro wins mitigation. Pro saves \$, but there's no impact to money being important. Pro can access some equality, but not for kids being born here everyday.

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: 337
Start: 1:00

5

Duva, Nicholas

Varsity Public Forum (Ridge SC vs. Capitol Debate CR)

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 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con	Team: Capitol Debate CR Circle Side: <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Allison Shim ²	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Rhea Chitaki ¹
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Ben Choi ⁴	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 RIDGE SC 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:

CON clearly defined costs and effects of eliminatory BC and followed up w/ appropriate evidence. Countered PRO's "effects" by showing their minimal impact did not outweigh costs. CON failed to counter PRO's evidence with their own stats. Provided mostly anecdotal evidence, not effective against CON's contentions.

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 HS

Room: 337

Start: 1:00

Varsity Public Forum (Capitol Debate BR vs. Ridge OW)

5

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: Capitol Debate BR Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Ridge OW Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Griffin Badalamante <u>1</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Tim O'Shea <u>2</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Raja Ramesh <u>3</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Ankit Wadhwa <u>4</u>

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

The team that won this debate is RIDGE OW 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:

CON presented stronger case for positive effects of retaining BC (eg positive effects on labor market) and harms (eg permanent underclass) if BC is abolished. PRO did not give adequate evidence for contention that citizenship more valued if earned. PRO questions to opponents lacked clarity and focus, and failed to address numerous examples/evidence provided 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: [Signature] REGIS HS

Room: 317

Start: 1:00

Varsity Public Forum (Cypress Bay KK vs. Delbarton AR)

5

Boggavarapu, Lav

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 Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Chad Klitzman 4
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Sami Klitzman 2

Team: Delbarton AR Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for August Atencio 1
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Braeden Reinoso 3

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

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Sami Well prepared & stated. Good references.

Chad: Well presented w/ facts

Comments to Debaters:

August Clearly stated their stand, Good articulation.

Braeden Good rebuttal & very animated!

These are the reasons for my decision:

CF₁ - Sami good questions.
CF₂ - Chad defended the questions well.

Cypress did a better job of presenting their case, asking the right questions and defending their stand.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: [Signature] SR/WR ARCHITECT

54 + 53 +

53 + 57

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

Room: 317
 Start: 1:00
 Varsity Public Forum (Regis BaRi vs. Delbarton CG)

5 Boggavarapu, Lav

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 BaRi Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for John Balleta 4
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Patrick Rice 2

Team: Delbarton CG Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Michael Cuppari 3
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Kevin Godart 1

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:

Pat Well presented & well supported.

John Ditto. Asked good questions

Comments to Debaters:

Kevin Well presented & supported.

Mike Ditto.

These are the reasons for my decision:

All the four ~~pa~~ debaters did extremely well & good questions were asked. Regis did a better job of defending their stand and answering the questions.

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]

45

11 + 59