

Room: 207  
Start: 6:45 PM  
JV Lincoln-Douglas

1

Lewis, James

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville IG

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Iize Greever

NEG

Henry W. Grady AO

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

Alex Opasahl

Winner: Asheville IG debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG dropped. AFF's attacks on her evidence and failed to respond to her Friedman and Gay cards. NEG was really left with little substantial evidence of any harms caused by granting autonomy to adolescents.

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Northwest Guilford HC		(0 - 30)		Pinecrest AE		(0 - 30)
Haleigh Cadd		<u>29</u>		Anire Egbe		<u>28</u>

Winner: Northwest Guilford HC School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Albert Ahn

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value - justice; achieving morality  
 morality - adolescents autonomous  
 cont 1 - age 14 - decision making  
 Priscilla Alderson - 120 people - med. decisions  
 conclusion - similar choices, capacity  
 a) put in situations  
 ex.1 Aug. 2015 - Philly assault  
 put aside adolescence in some legal cases  
 325 sentenced as adults PA  
 b) adolescent decision-making re: babies  
 autonomous choices  
 competent decisions  
 cont 2 - competent autonomous choices  
 parents believe teenagers can make such choices  
 grey matter/early adolescence

Cross: consequentialism definition  
 adolescents = minors = no rights  
 J. Alderson - cannot classify adolescents as minors  
 PFC - different growth rates  
 emotions are uncontrollable in adolescents (hospital MRI simulations)  
 agree that diff people dev. at diff rates.

Cont #2 Not all adolescents can make competent decisions  
 UK opinion - no universal basis for competence  
 Journal of Family Therapy  
 Without rights, there is no justice for adolescents.

Adolescent and adult decision-making ability very close.  
 Adolescents tried in court as adults. Harvard put 14 year olds

Adolescents make decisions for their babies.  
 1st and 2nd columns of app. PFC not fully dev'd yet agree variation of adolescent development  
 3rd contention: different stages; counter British psychology citation. J. Allison - prof. psychology  
 Alderson is a veggie concept  
 Reason for decision: The aff made more consistent and supported arguments. Close round.  
 PFC may not be  
 rent of bad choice by adolescents.

Cross: Value = justice  
 must give rights re: medical choices  
 Harvard experiment: emulate real life?

Grey matter vs. Prefrontal cortical development  
 treatment of some juveniles as adults in court system vs. treatment of adolescents as adults for medical decisions.  
 (Contention 1: PFC not fully developed.)

**Point Scale:**  
 Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**  
 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

(Consequentialism; utilitarianism, prone to make mistakes)  
 Adult consent - brain not fully mature  
 Adults make medical decisions  
 PFC - rational decisions; not fully developed  
 Brain is not fully developed - cont #2  
 abstract thinking; thought analysis  
 Last part to mature - by age 25  
 Cont #3. Manuel Kant German philosopher  
 action under similar circumstances

Opp. case:  
 375 juveniles (versus 325 stated by  
 Experimentation vs. real life aff).  
 Justice and value  
 adolescents already have autonomy  
 adolescent parents and medical choices for babies  
 Adult consent - cannot define adolescents as minors  
 Defense: adolescence vague - age of fully developed PFCs  
 Brain dev 17 vs. 25 (mimic) 13-17  
 is diff. source? Adults have fully developed PFCs  
 Aff: experiment vs. real life  
 have capacity of making decisions  
 Consequences of conduct, PEDs.  
 Consequences of autonomous choices  
 Adolescents have same rights 13-17.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
Henry Clay SA		(0 - 30)		Centreville AL	(0 - 30)
Shelby Amato		<u>28.5</u>		Andrew Lee	<u>29</u>

Winner: Centreville AL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Caroline Lee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg case presented + upheld value of morality consistently and expertly. Tied in implications of his value with those projected for the aff.

Aff did a spectacular job presenting her case but came up short when addressing neg's points against her value of autonomy in VC.

Shelby - You're an excellent speaker. Case organization started out very strong. Be really careful to not drop opponent's points in favor of strengthening your case and make sure things don't get lost in flow. (and the ACT/SAT point was headed in a good direction, don't second guess!)

Andrew - great job defending your value. crystallization at the end really sold your case. Attacking your opp's value earlier on would've tied your case up pretty solid but rhetorically your NR worked fine.

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College JW

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

25

Jasmine Walker

NEG

Northwest Guilford CD

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

29

Capri D'Souza

Winner:

Jasmine Walker SandHoke

debating on the

AFF

Low point win?

yes

School/Team

Early College

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Ian Miller

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- oral critique given

- emphasis on weighing - I don't want to evaluate your arguments but you really don't give me a choice

- Framework is very important! Do not skimp on constructive explanation and elaboration in rebuttals

- AC make sure to respond in an organized way, this was your greatest weakness

- NC you were very articulate and organized but I didn't buy your arguments from the beginning

- AC less effective at responding to NC but had very well constructed constructive

- AC did supply the only weighing mechanism given in round - Stats related to trans suicide rates - this carries through the flow

- based off the weighing mechanism provided and my intervention (which was required bc no other weighing) I had to vote Aff, but

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

I really would have preferred to vote Neg based off of mechanics in round. Ultimately LD is about arguments themselves, not argumentation and the

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Guilford AW

Alex White

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

NEG

Marist MC

Mackenzie Childs

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25.5

Winner: Marist MC School/Team debating on the Neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Allison Hays

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Neg. argument was constructed better... just more hard evidence*

*Both debaters talked very fast. I could not even hear the evidence.*

*I asked them to go slowly and think about audience before we began*

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

St James GK

Gibeom Kim

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Cary JT

Justin Tunley

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Cary JT School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Shorten the framework - It's smart but too long
- Slow down a little so that you speak clearer. (CX was a little difficult to understand)
- Nice job trying to use his C2 against him in CX
- You slur when reading your stats when you explain afterwards I can understand 10x better
- Emphasize key words to help me understand your argument.
- Extend your case in the 1AR
- Voters in the 2AR are very important

NEG

- Don't make arguments in CX
  - ask question during CX
  - I like the question regarding restricting autonomy. Keep that mindset going
  - Signpost a little clearer
  - Don't play w/ the and jacket
  - Try to keep your feet planted
- I can tell you tried giving voters, so next time, list them for me and say why these are the most important issues
- Your clarity was much better on the 2NR

\*I would shorten your case to have more rebuttal time

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

RFD

Both sides read me studies saying conflicting information about the developing mind. I give that a wash. The framework debate was equal as well. Overall, I vote Neg because he better argues his points and gives the Hauser example that I believe he won.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary OS

Oonagh Stevans

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST AK

Amitesh Kotwal

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner:

Amitesh Kotwal

debating on the

Neg

Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

\* I have chosen to negate the resolution. overall the neg was able to provide logical and linear attacks. He proved parents help adoles. determine their autonomy and ultimately won the round because of it. Aff conceded on a few points which weakened her stance.

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 8 Min Aff | 5 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min TART | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff \* You kept buttoning & unbuttoning your blazer during questioning. Try to avoid fidgeting.  
\* Buying a house question fell a little flat. You gave up w/ a "ok, fair enough" response when you're correct. The resolution says nothing about follow through.  
\* You conceded during questioning which seriously hurt partner's development.  
\* make sure you use modern evidence.

Neg \* You keep saying "I'm sorry" while questioning. Try not to apologize.  
\* I know you have a lot to say, however it would be ~~more~~ beneficial to take a moment to collect your thoughts. Everything would come out smoother.  
\* Direct clash! Excellent attacks on your opponent's case. Thank you for being consistent!

prep used 4 min | prep used 4 min

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Andrey Kell AM

Anna Marsicano

POINTS

(0-30)

29

NEG

SandHoke Early College AB

Austin Bell

POINTS

28.5

Winner: Andrey Kell AM debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - good job of rebutting each of Neg's contentions. Crystallize sooner and you will be better off. Speak clearly, watch your time: you need to be very clearly identifying your voting issues. Nice projection.

Neg - really good points and very sound reasoning but often obscured by your lack of organization (?) or articulation (?) I very much liked your focus on Harry. However, you came perilously close to a counterplan when you spoke about mentoring, collective decision-making etc. I do not believe you addressed Aff's contention 2, so it stood. Aff rebutted all of your contentions. Good job identifying voting issues. By not rebutting all of Aff's contentions, you lost. Speak up, you have good things to say!

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.



# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
SandHoke Early College NK		(0-30)	Providence SZ	(0-30)
Nicholas Kyle		<u>25</u>	Sunny Zhang	<u>27</u>

Winner: Sunny Zhang Providence SZ debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: S Daugherty

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF  
Read off case - didn't seem to know case well.  
Didn't stand to deliver AC  
↑ volume  
Aff clearly nervous but  
when he calmed down  
he could deliver some good analysis

NEG  
When you get  
excited you become  
a bit difficult to  
understand. Slow  
down + enunciate

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX  
17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR |  
6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff dropped Neg C3, C1. This was damaging to  
drop C1 which was strong stating that children are  
dependent upon adults so why should children  
be allowed this one exception. I wish  
Aff had been able to establish statistics that  
transgendered youth comprised a significant component  
of society because Neg brought up a great  
~~counterpoint~~ poorly-argued point on Aff C1, ~~with~~  
pointing out the mental number of transgendered youth  
& stated wisely that "on the side doesn't prove  
anything."

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Cary NJ		Northwest Guilford AY	
Noah Jabusch	<u>28.5</u>	Anna Yang	<u>28.5</u>

Winner: CARY NJ School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

delivery  
 pacing was clear and deliberate  
 CX & rebuttal  
 pretty good poise in the face  
 of aggressive questions  
 interesting question on your  
 case demonstrating ability  
 to think forwardly  
 timing issue in the 1AR

delivery was commanding  
 aggressive questions were  
 pretty effective on transgen  
 contentions,  
 attacks on value/criteria  
 was good but could have  
 been more effective, especially  
 needed a direct attack on agency

RFD

In the opinion of the judge this was a quality debate so early in the season. Each debater demonstrated some instances of both effective rhetoric and some technical debate skill. But at the same time, some missteps were certainly made. I bought the AFF point that no clear attack was made on the AFF value, while on the NEG side, there was ineffective time management in the 1AR. Ultimately, I did narrowly give the round to the AFF, I agreed to a great degree the round had to be viewed through the AFF value/criteria structure because of the lack of clear attacks on agency. The NEG was a strong speaker, commanding and confident & was and deserving of

high speaker points

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Centreville BK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Brian Kim

NEG

St James JG

POINTS

(0 - 30)

24

Jason Grate

Winner: Centreville BK debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Nathan Arrington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff won value claim by pointing out necessity of liberty for justice, and Aff world promoted world in which rights are upheld, while neg world lacked the warrants to deprive 90% percent of rights

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Aff

Neg

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

- paper copy of speech is old school but lets you see judge during speech
- Go through AC and clear out ALL unsupported normative statements within subpoints.
- ARI, give more defense of own case since did not attack supports, but he did attack validity of warrants which you did not address
- Locke still hierarchy of rights so transitive property doesn't apply

- In NC attack on AC, if attacking a point need to flush out the attack more. make claims, give support and warrant in a few sentences to provide full argument against opponent's points
- Could bulk up NC with more data, especially to provide medical context to debate
- Keep to a structure in NR, even if it's going point by point it will keep you talking the full time
- Crystallize in NR at end so judge knows the major reasons why you should win the

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Marist LM

Liam Mullican

POINTS

(0-30)  
29.5

NEG

SandHoke Early College BJ

Brenna Johnson

POINTS

(0-30)  
28.5

Winner:

Marist LM

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC could use higher speed, more enunciation, and most importantly, clearer impacts to the AC value. NC straight concedes 2 mins of speech time and drops the VC and the most important Aff contention as a result.

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Neg could arguably extend their own VC and cross-apply contention-level offense to secure the win, but NR was a bit disorganized and didn't quite get there.

Overall, very strong JV round. Both debaters have clear potential.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Thomas Jefferson HSST RM		(0-30)		Cary EK		(0-30)
Rachel Ma		<u>29</u>		Enoch Kuan		<u>27</u>

Winner: Aff Thomas Jefferson HSST RM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thomas Jefferson RM -

I think your first 3 weak here that says adolescents will move away from parental influence if they get to make decisions on their own

Cary EK -

- your first argument isn't compelling - I need a reason to weigh Justice/Morality
- you make some tenuous arguments that make you have to defend things that you don't want to defend - For example - you say that a 14 yr old has to justify his religious beliefs to refuse treatment, what makes an adult different.
- avoid identifying a plan - parents is better than courts, but neither is preferable
- I think you need a new case - one based on determinism

**Point Scale:**  
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**  
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff substantially warrants her arguments and provide solid reasons why I should buy into her framework. She also responds down the flow adequately to almost all arguments made by opponent. Neg fails to uphold and warrant value of Justice and relies too heavily on anecdotal and individual case studies that aren't fleshed out

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary CF

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

26

Chelsea Fang

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST NB

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Naman Baraya

Winner: Thomas Jefferson School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Angeline Morales

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- more value clash → Morality ≠ Justice  
expand your def.  
• the life only valued as an end?  
• Life always prep for wellbeing?  
- what if unwanted?

- a pure util round comes down to hard to prove card-level arguments — stay away from this

**Point Scale:**

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

**Speech Times:**

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 14 Min Prep.

AFF

- good composition
- give voter issues → it have to go off whatever is given

NEG

- good evidence — don't rely solely on it though
- explicate reasoning — leave room for your own analysis

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Providence BS

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

29

Bennett Stillerman

NEG

SandHoke Early College AM

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Alysson Miller

Winner: Providence BS School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? ~~NO~~ NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff  
Could slow down a bit, left time on the clock for 1st speech  
Strong CX  
Good use of extension

Strong case.  
clear to narrow to "homeless"

Neg  
Use more cross time  
Need to address specific points of his case. Did not address easy subpoints such as mental health issues

You should time yourself  
Nice job of trying, refuse VC.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College GK

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

22

Gabriel Kranenburg

NEG

Asheville EH

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

26

Eli Hardwig

Winner: Eli Hardwig School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Patrick D. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- 1) In your 1AR, you did a nice job of defending your side - make sure you attack the NEG side as well.
- 2) Your observation is at counter purposes to your contentions as it asserts a general principle, but you only provide one major example necessitating autonomy.

NEG win for reasons 1, 2, + 3.

NEG

- 3) What an intriguing case with your distinction between local + programmed autonomy - however, I kept wanting you to qualify this distinction directly to medical choices instead of to a broader conception of the adolescent.
- 4) Also, it seems as though the Aff's core ideas + contentions could have presented a serious challenge, as transgender youth have a clear life plan born out of their suffering as they have had to resist their parents' & peer's influence upon them.
- 5) Great debating style!

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.