

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Guilford CD

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Capri D'Souza

NEG

Henry Clay SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

Shelby Amato

Winner: Henry Clay School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Drew Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both AFF & NEG provided well organized frameworks and should be commended for well-spoken deliveries.

Both AFF & NEG addressed all points of contention from the opposing side.

~~The slight~~

The reason for the decision for the Neg is that the AFF did not make a strong enough argument on the second contention. ~~and~~ The AFF did not have a solid argument against the NEG's 2nd contention. Also, the NEG presentation was fully supported and slightly better delivered.

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

Cary EK

Enoch Kuan

POINTS
(0-30)

27

NEG

Centreville BK

Brian Kim

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Winner: Enoch Kuan debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Patrick D. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff Strong cases on both sides
You both have a wise style of debating.
- NEG
- Strong to emphasize the value clash, the courts' role in upholding your observation and the crucial real-world dimension of your advocacy
 - NEG's definition of autonomous meaning independence without any advisement from others was somewhat abusive which you might have directly attacked. Autonomy is more about ultimate right of self-determination, which may legitimately involve and allow for seeking advice from others first.
 - You might have pointed out that NEG dropped your C2
 - Dropped Aff's C2
 - Be careful not to oversimplify the value clash. Util is not the only way to establish justice
 - You also needed to provide more evidence. Adolescents may have a tendency towards risky behavior but that tendency does not mean they are not capable of autonomy in life or death situations involving medical decisions, unless you can prove more specific harms than the Aff side.

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 wins for reasons 1, 4-6.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College AM

Alysson Miller

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Asheville IG

Ilze Greever

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Asheville IG debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters spoke intelligently and confidently, but the NEG considered the issue from a broader perspective and supported all her points effectively and ethically, while the AFF approached the issue from the limited perspective of the decision's impact on transgender adolescents. Both sides attempted concessions and rebuttals but the neg demonstrated a stronger understanding of the skill while the Aff's skill demonstrated some circular logic.

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

Pinecrest AE

Anire Egbe

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Marist LM

Liam Mullican

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Marist LM debating on the Neg.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Allison Hays

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both did an excellent job of arguing their sides. Neg had a bit more evidence + articulated it more clearly. Aff also did an excellent job and was very convincing just could have incorporated evidence more seamlessly in it.
Great job !!

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
Centreville AL

Andrew Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

SandHoke Early College JW

Jasmine Walker

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

Winner: Andrew Lee debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to affirm the resolution. The aff. provided direct clash that furthered the debate. The neg. provided more attacks, however she kept crashing instead of responding to the continuation after the IAR. Both debaters have lots of potential & I believe will grow a lot. in the upcoming year.

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: 5 Min Aff 5 Min CX
17 Min Neg 13 Min CX 14 Min IAR
6 Min NR 13 Min 2AR 14 Min Prep.

Aff * Monitor your Adgiting. You kept adjusting your tie and checking your pen lid.
* Don't waste speaking time going over a road map. You can do that off time.
* Be confident w/ your voice. Use inflection to emphasize points.
* Don't look at your opp.

Neg * Use your questioning time! You had 40 sec. remaining.
* Good "hair" question! ... but you let your opp. get out of it. Use it in the future to show short term thinking from adobes. & not long term.
* Project your voice "I know you have it in you!"
* Stick w/ LP! You've got potential!
* Don't look at your opp.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
SandHoke Early College BJ		Northwest Guilford HC	
Brenna Johnson	<u>27</u>	Haleigh Cadd	<u>25</u>

Winner: SandHoke Early College BJ debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff did a better job linking her case through the value framework. Neg also did not adequately rebut the aff case; it is insufficient to disregard 4 contentions on the premise that only a minority fall into the category. Aff, on the other hand hit each contention of Neg and pointed out a contradiction in the case that Neg did not have an answer for.

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.

Suggestions

Aff - Try to create a more balanced case. If ~~someone~~ someone discredits transgender individuals as an example then your whole case would collapse.

Neg - Try to use your CX more efficiently. You did not push your opponent into any corners; you instead basically gave part of your rebuttal during the CX.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary JT

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

Justin Tunley

NEG

SandHoke Early College GK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Gabriel Kranenburg

Winner: Cary JT debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: S Daugherty

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 | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff laid out an articulate, well-organized and tight case, hit every neg C and refuted flawlessly. Aff. Thank you for accommodating my preferences on the fly - your Road map + sign post were lovely, helpful + kind - great job Excellent speaker. You were correct, AFF, in pointing out an extension of your C1 + C2 across the flow as Neg dropped them entirely + per my paradigm - you win in this alone.

Neg - you too are a good speaker who related some articulate + well-analyzed refutation. You could have hit the C1 by stating that this weak case study evidence is proof that the system is currently working and illustrate your value of morality. You could have hit the C2 by providing examples of juvenile detainees (statistics) who have created harm by making their own choices. Maybe find that case.

Thanks,
S. Daugherty

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Northwest Guilford AY
Anna Yang

POINTS
(0 - 30)
30

NEG
SandHoke Early College NK
Nicholas Kyle

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27

Winner: NW Guilford School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Laura Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - Good eye contact, clear speech

Good CX - you went through his whole case & questioned everything.

*Roadmap 1AR - Let me know where you're going to start before the speech.

Should spend some more time talking about your own case and bringing up your stronger points.

Careful about bringing up new arguments in 2AR

Give voters

Neg - Don't let her take over CX! (when it's your CX)

3rd Contentions can be cut

*Roadmap - It was difficult to find what points you were attacking.

Don't address opp as "you"

"My opp said....."

Court argument was a new argument in NR - didn't ~~represent~~ flow it.

NR is a different speech - really force yourself to go down the flow and attack all her arguments instead of just defending your own.

Give voters

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

Providence SZ

Sunny Zhang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Ardrey Kell AM

Anna Marsicano

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Ardrey Kell AM debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff's ^{argument} ~~ability to rea~~ contention that they are unable to reason is silly and rather mean-spirited, especially for JV. Aff could have won off of contention-level offense, but the disorganization of the AR and ZAR left me confused as to ^{how} ~~why~~ exactly, the Aff was protecting their standard from the NC attacks. As a result, I applied the NC standard, which Aff could have met, but chose not to.

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.

Both debaters should use all of their rebuttal time and work on organization.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville EH

Eli Hardwig

POINTS

(0-30)

28

NEG

Cary NJ

Noah Jabusch

POINTS

(0-30)

27

Winner: Eli Hardwig debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:  

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Interesting angle on trans-gender issue. Disagree with assertion that 1 case proves your argument. You left your case wide open w/ the statement that if a more significant population (than Trans) can be proven harm, then NEG wins. Good attack on idea that doctors are somehow perfectly objective. More warrants on harm to transgender adolescents would be nice.

Leaving huge amounts of time on the clock - 54 seconds on CrossX and 45 seconds on Constructive. Value and criteria seem to justify the establishment of a fascist state with respect to medical decisions, i.e. don't just refuse autonomy to adolescents, but take it from adults as well. It is a self-defeating argument. The issue with societal harm from vaccinations is not related to adolescent autonomy, but rather role of parent/guardian.

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.

Voting for AFF, not so much on strength of AFF case as much as weakness in NEG case. AFF wins, but neither case is very well supported.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College AB

Austin Bell

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Northwest Guilford AW

Alex White

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

1:45

Winner: Sandhoke AB debating on the AFF side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~if~~ you're talking about having to defend in general then your case is super specific - this is a potential weakness

* sorry for being bad w/ time signals - I didn't strike you for this

Don't let your opponent dominate cross

* expand evidence.

* I'd suggest investing in a small timer.

focus on warrant

* remember to signpost your NC was 9:45 which is long. Allocate more time for rebuttal - not just 2 mins.

* use prep!

NR/NC

focus on general arguments about his case - think back to resolution.

← → specificity

← → your evidence

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.

Needs lack of offense in my round - had to note off flow extended contentions and off values carried across

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Thomas Jefferson HSST NB

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Naman Baraya

NEG

Cary OS

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

Oonagh Stevans

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSST NB debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Linda Greever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

more able to handle information give

aff:
well organized with good focus on contentions. some nice evidence not sure how medical errors are decreased by clinical trials.

good speaking but be aware of ~~Protonmas~~ your increasing volume as the more you are trying to make pts. It can be helpful but it at times continues to increase more and more

neg:
organized, good speaking skills nice info on difference of brain functions between adults and adolescents.

protection from parents/guardian - need more info (not necessary numbers) information from credible source and info on precise legal law would improve your overall argument.

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 | 13 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
Henry W. Grady AO
Alex Opasahl

POINTS
(0-30)
26

NEG
Thomas Jefferson HSST RM
Rachel Ma

POINTS
(0-30)
27

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSST RM debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Angeline Morales

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both of you spoke clearly
- Good pace

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

- good evidence
- be careful with saying "people become just bodies, you're nothing"
make sure you respond to all of your opponent's subpoints - you can group them, but point it out

NEG

- your framework about education didn't really hit in on the contentions - level
- tangibility argument did not make sense - why does something tangible inherently more value?

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.

Room: 214
Start: 8:00 AM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

2

Justice Kage
McGuaig, John

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Marist MC

Mackenzie Childs

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Providence BS

Bennett Stillerman

POINTS

(0 - 30)

~~28~~ 30

Winner: Providence BS School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: J. Justice

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
you both did yourselves a bit of a disservice by running a policy - like intro, so fast as to be nearly - unintelligible and difficult to catch up, VC etc.

Neg
and

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.

I think you harmed your case by choosing an over-specific interpretation of the resolution for which you could not show any gain in your value criterion.

VP ✓
VCR ✓
Harms ✓
Cost-benefit ✓
Solvency ✓

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Thomas Jefferson HSST AK		(0-30)	St James GK	(0-30)
Amitesh Kotwal		<u>30</u>	Gibeom Kim	<u>24</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSST AK School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: *Amitesh Kotwal*

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff case went mainly unrefuted and Aff won framework debate

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	Neg
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good case framework in AC • Could have linked framework arguments together just to save some time to address AC points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to speak up to make it easier to hear points of case • Maintain a structure while attacking aff points. Make attack claim, give support and warrant, and move on • Only 4 mins in NR, so you have time to either flush out. • 1:30 on NR, even if you don't think you'll win the round, keep arguing because it only takes one point lodged in the judge's brain to potentially win them over in the end

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

St James JG

Jason Grate

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25.0

NEG

Cary CF

Chelsea Fang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29.0

Winner: Cary CF debating on the NEG.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Joseph Yang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: He apparently has worked hard to prepare, included a lot of very good valuable information, presented in a very organized way. But. He lacked eye contact, overly dependent on reading materials.

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: She did an excellent job. Organized her point of view in a very step-wise approach. very good examples. good eye contact, gesture during debate. She is very familiar with her material, able to cite it effectively in arguing her point of view.