

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Centreville AL	(0-30)	Asheville EH	(0-30)
Andrew Lee	29	Eli Hardwig	28.5

Winner: Centreville AL debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Freedom / Declaration of Independence  
Autonomous adolescents; definition of adolescence  
value of liberty; Patrick Henry  
2) autonomy - important of decision  
adolescent oncology example; consent → compliance  
Confidentiality → product of autonomy; physician confidentiality  
competent medical decisions proven - adolescents adapt  
adolescent choices should be followed in spite of parent objection  
cont 3 - adolescents right to control over own body; John Stewart  
health care providers recognize importance of (Harm Principle)  
18 is arbitrary;  
Xexam: programmatic autonomy? vs. local autonomy?  
unrealistic ambitious → medical decisions?  
Focusing on one type of autonomy complicates resolution.  
Values: liberty > authenticity  
Opponent's incapable of making life plans; do have ability to  
make life plans).  
Jared Adolescent Health; Dr. Payot,  
adolescents are capable.  
Peer pressure - to confidentiality; remove peer pressure; no negative influence.  
Reemphasis: prove adol. complied: improved outcomes; make competent medical decisions  
Right to control own bodies. Arbitrary age of 18.  
2AR: Values - liberty: has not been refuted; superior to authenticity  
Opp. says try to simplify Autonomy. Contends - adolescents are capable  
of rational and complex decisions.  
Resolution  
1st content - improved medical outcomes  
2nd content - improved to confidentiality  
3rd content - med. professionals agree; freedom / autonomous medical choices  
right to control own bodies.

Xexam: autonomy - existing independently  
decisions influenced by environmental  
Adolescence - WHO definition  
Autonomy differentiation; episodic autonomy  
Authenticity - moral decisions  
programmatic autonomy  
Myers -  
life plans; intent choice  
difficulty to longer plan  
Stembo's 2008 - peers / resistance / until age 18 +  
cannot meet criteria  
adolescent autonomy  
create + reject  
incapable of achieving true autonomy  
Myers - domestic housewife example; affirmative default  
Agrees to programmatic autonomy  
Age of 18 arbitrary.  
Points app. concedes 2 types of autonomy (local)  
determine the truth of authenticity  
Neg contends adolescent have difficulty rational long-term  
plans.

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.

Reason for decision:  
Great debate! I really enjoyed the energy and the give and take. You both settled  
nightly and impressively. In the end, the Aff ~~clerked~~ clerked out the win with a slightly better  
adherence to framework. Both of  
vs. should be proud!!!

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cary JT		(0 - 30)	Cary NJ	(0 - 30)
Justin Tunley		<u>28</u>	Noah Jabusch	<u>26</u>

Winner: Tunley - Cary JT debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg did not provide an argument against the resolution. He only provided a counterplan to Aff's case. In this sense neg lost the round due to not debating the resolution. All he did, in essence, was agree w/ the aff. providing an alternate scenario as to why adolescents could not make medical decisions. Neg also went down the rabbit hole of vaccination debate and spent more of his argument there than on our resolution.

**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.

Kudos to aff for finally seeing this and pointing it out. Nice job on giving Aff's case a balanced look. I would suggest you have more cards and evidence to back up your case. ☺

Neg - stick w/ the resolution you have. Your arguments might have worked but not w/ this topic.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF  
Asheville IG  
Iize Greever

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
27

NEG  
Thomas Jefferson HSST RM  
Rachel Ma

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
20

Winner: Rachel Ma debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to negate the resolution. The negation provided a more thorough analysis and direct clash throughout the round. The aff started strong! but lost some of her stamina once she was challenged. I felt like she was faltering.  
GOOD ROUND! Nice matching.

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: 4 Min 15 Sec  
1 Min 15 Sec 2 Min 15 Sec 3 Min 15 Sec 4 Min 15 Sec  
6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min 1AR | 4 Min 2AR

Aff + you shift your weight b/t feet. Find a comfortable stance 😊  
• good for you not wasting your time cx'ing the neg by answering, but you should have pushed & given 2nd ex.  
• Be sure to address all points made by your opp, you mention some w/ it needs thorough analysis & attack  
• spend more time developing your third contention.

Neg \* you avoided a few questions during questioning. Answer your opponents questions, if your being cross-exed you shouldn't be asking your opp. questions.  
\* you refute in a linear manner which is very easy to follow.  
\* Overall, you are the better debater in the round, but always ask judge pref. when you enter a room.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Pinecrest AE		(0 - 30)		St James GK		(0 - 30)
Anire Egbe		<u>26</u>		Gibeom Kim		<u>27</u>

Winner: Pinecrest AE <sup>ST James GK</sup> debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Scott Findley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

13-17  
Not controlled by outside forces  
Morality  
Justice - Individual Autonomy  
Self determination ← immature, need to protect ② → neg states depend on parents  
Human motivation w/o outside influences ← not responsible to them → need to become less dependent on parents decision to become independent  
Limit external influences ← if influenced then also cared by parents  
Mozart 18 ← biological diff than adults, leads to irrational choices → not all adults are mature  
14 brain same as 25 ← brain developing ①  
juvenile tried as adults  
begin to gain certain rights  
Capacity  
14 yr old 95% developed ① context ← does not mean has ability → neg & Aff agree  
not all the time, when opp presents itself → able to make decisions at times  
14 ≠ adult, does have mental capacity to → shared decision making  
make medical decisions

14-18  
self Govern  
Justice  
Proper balance of family values ← well being of society, individuals → under parental right w/ guidance ②  
obligation to parents  
a) recip. to parents ← child remains dependent on outside influences ② → not challenged in moral & just  
born to weak, vulnerable ← neg impact remain dependent on parents  
b) Investment Principle ← still minors and under control, just parents would not make all decisions  
who has rights  
parental rights are valid → children under jurisdiction of parents

**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: Should ask about Adol. who are parents

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

Cary CF

Ardrey Kell AM

Chelsea Fang

Anna Marsicano

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Winner: Chelsea Fang School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Patrick D. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- 1) The observation was key!
- 2) I love how the entirety of your case fits together, as your C2 shows that adolescents can be just as rational as adults and more so at times (per your C1).

NEG

- 3) C1 was a wash - you had a strong card but your opponent argued analytically that family tension could diminish if an autonomous medical decision made an adolescent happy.
- 4) you did not fully address AFF's main example in her C1 about parental beliefs harmful to the adolescent.

**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 appreciate the ~~the~~ thorough approach both of you took to the flow though the definition and value criterion debate were not crucial to the outcome of this particular debate

Aff wins for reasons 1-4.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Northwest Guilford CD	<u>28</u>	SandHoke Early College BJ	<u>27</u>
Capri D'Souza		Brenna Johnson	

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not a very strong debate overall. Both debaters had weak (and short) constructive sections, and the cross led to asking the same question again and again and receive the same answer again and again. The rebuttal section defined the decision - the AFF did a great job with the tools she was given, while the NEG spoke for 2.5 of her 7 minute rebuttal with pregnant pauses. Not a lot of strong evidence incorporated by either side. As a minor issue, Brenna rolled her eyes and displayed a minor attitude at several points during the debate - not sure if that was a purposeful persona but just felt like it should be addressed. She just seemed very irritated so I hope she's OK!

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

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
Northwest Guilford HC		(0 - 30)	Cary EK	(0 - 30)
Haleigh Cadd		<u>26</u>	Enoch Kuan	<u>28</u>

Winner: Northwest Guilford debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Y

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** Good speaking / argument and content. Weak response to cross-ex. You need to be clear in your mind, what autonomy meant in your case / good cross-ex zeroing in on definition of competence / value more prevalent because autonomy is inherent in the value of justice. / Cancellation of first contention / Missed attacking the contention. / Parents taking care of their children. / ~~Rebuttal~~ You are repeating your constructive argument in Rebuttal.

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.

**NEG:** Good cross-ex / ~~line of~~ Religion belief case / Jehovah's witness case / Good job addressing opponent's contention. / You lose on value? and framework to the 'Aff' but 'Aff' did a bad job with rebuttal of your contentions. It is not clear however what you are advocating. If appear like you want the state to protect adolescent's rights.

**REASON:** Both cases are weak, but Aff had better flow upholding her framework. Since Aff stuck to her case and contention based on the evidence. Aff wins this round. / I have to drop Neg on ~~introduction~~ argument.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

Henry W. Grady AO

SandHoke Early College NK

Alex Opasahl

Nicholas Kyle

POINTS

POINTS

(0-30)

(0-30)

29

26

Winner: Henry W. Grady AO  
Alex Opasahl debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO  
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg did not address AC in 1st UC!

- face judge when speaking
- Use prep time & speaking time better
- can't bring up evidence in NR

AFF - Nice job, but don't to argue w/ rebuttal.

**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	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Providence SZ	(0-30)	Henry Clay SA	(0-30)
Sunny Zhang	<u>27</u>	Shelby Amato	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: 

**AFF** Comments & Reason for Decision:

Be careful about saying "Studies generally support" without naming or citing any of them. Rebuttal was disorganized and poorly delivered. If we use VOI as the VC, then why not extend autonomy to 10 yr olds, 6 yr olds, 2 yr olds?? Good call out of lack of warrants on the NEG side. Why bring in autonomy at the very end? Stay on Justice

NEG: Good attack of veil of ignorance relative to it being a potentially dangerous approach. I question the assertion that the AFF world affects legal decisions in criminal cases as opposed to just the medical arena. Organized rebuttal with good coverage on the flow. Don't leave 1:46 on the clock during rebuttal.

**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.

The logic and arguments on both sides have problems - I would really call it a wash/tie. Deferring to the NEG based on presentation as a tie breaker

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Cary OS	<u>29</u>	SandHoke Early College JW	<u>26</u>
Oonagh Stevans		Jasmine Walker	

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

Signature: Ty Stuelke

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both cases were strong, but due to the unaddressed framework on the AFF side I give the win to AFF. The 3 criteria for making a medical choice and the idea of holding adolescent decisions to the same standard as adults gave the aff a strong footing that Neg could not defeat.

#### 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.

## Advice

Aff - Spend some time in your final speech focusing on the voting issues. I could see your important points, but some judges might have missed it. Make sure to emphasize your framework if it's not addressed.

Neg - You had a strong constructive, but your rebuttals were less organized. Try to address each point in the order that your opponent presented them; it makes following you easier as a judge.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF 1:34

NEG 2:15r

Thomas Jefferson HSST NB

POINTS  
(0-30)

SandHoke Early College AB

POINTS  
(0-30)

Naman Baraya

28

Austin Bell

24

Winner: Naman Baraya debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Tiffany Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

Your case seems well-researched and organized.

You have a strong basis in and understanding of LD components/structure and ~~ess~~ terminology. Rather than simply knowing it, you actually can apply it. Well done!  
and explain it

You did (sort of) drop ~~your~~ his third contention and didn't fully connect to why shared decision making would not solve. However, ~~the~~ these arguments held no/little weight ~~to~~ since you won on framework.

Consider how to deal w/ shared decision making - NEG could have developed this more - if so, does the AFF allow for both to happen?

Contention 3 suggests that adolescents need a supportive community to properly mature and develop. Had NEG connected this to his other pts - would the AFF world allow a role for this?

as in, making it connect to shared decision-making

NEG

Don't let AFF talk so much - this is your time, so if he is giving you too much info or rambling, ask or tell him to stop, and proceed with other questions.

**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.

6 3  
7 3

I think you know what you want to say, but just momentarily lost the thoughts. Make sure you have an outline to follow so you can keep going, and you may even be able to pre-write blocks that you can read in response to anticipated arguments from your opponent.

**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.

4  
6  
3

Don't define words if they are not important to your arguments (You didn't need ought)

You need to better explain (or be prepared to explain) ethics of care. Have a card, but also be able to break it down in your own words.

I know what you mean when you say that life is important before everything else (obviously we have to live) but in saying it this way you have conceded that the best (moral) world protects life

- Suggest that life is sometimes sacrificed by his contentions (those medical studies?)
- Are there trade-offs when death is not the worst possible outcome?
- What about the risk of death from allowing teen choices? (Refuse treatment, etc.)

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Thomas Jefferson HSST AK	(0 - 30)	Providence BS	(0 - 30)
Amitesh Kotwal	<u>27</u>	Bennett Stillerman	<u>26</u>

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

Signature: Ian Miller

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Neg advocacy is weak
- both neg & aff fumble in rebuttals to rebut one another, really knowing your position will help this
- don't see very clear link between NC FW and advocacy
- ended up voting Aff bc their links to FW hold more under attack
- both need to work on weighing - especially w/ util I need more clear metrics so I don't need to intervene

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.

GOOD OVERALL TO BOTH NEG & AFF

- work on speaking skills & mechanics and mastering the topic & you will be very successful

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Centreville BK		Marist MC	
Brian Kim	<u>27</u>	Mackenzie Childs	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Logan

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 | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

RFD:

- ① I buy the Argument that standards have to be objective
- ② Harris in the NC gives legitimate grounds to science as a standard
- ③ Cards in NC were unrefuted showing legit scientific hurdles to DPE
- ④ Moon: Adolescents ought to be considered on a case by case basis.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF  
Northwest Guilford AW  
Alex White

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
28.9

NEG  
SandHoke Early College AM  
Alysson Miller

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
28.8

Winner: Alex White debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? 1

Signature: Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Alex you have an excellent speech style. Contention level argument were well thought out, warranted & presented. you should consider adding more focus on values criteria. you did not really warrant or provide reasons for why value morally autonomy, make sure you end at time. Never go over if you cannot, especially 20 sec +

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.

Alysson, try to make sure you have more cross questions prepared in advance so you don't spend time so early. No need to warrant morally when aff also deserves morally. Just move to VC, best they care. Excellent. Need to work on response to off args. When you say you will come back to autonomy, make sure you do, especially when you finish early. Sometimes in statements & cross responses you speak glibly - work on not doing that, you are no good when loaded & forceful. Terrible you keep saying Moral & not morality.

Aff wins value criteria debate if both sides agree value of morality aff vs of autonomy dropped by neg. said would go & address but didn't take to do so & second neg. Also may neg args relied on assumptions that winners could not do something like minor which was subject of debate. Arg alone also not seem to get a start. Aff did better overall job proving level & contention level arguments. Good job both sides for JV

3/2/11c

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
St James JG		(0-30)	SandHoke Early College GK	(0-30)
Jason Grate		<u>27.5</u>	Gabriel Kranenburg	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jason

- enunciate
- One of your responses was simply, "that does not apply" - I need more argument than this
- I'm worried about where you draw the brightline of parental obligation and allowing adolescents to have autonomy - it's not clear if this is just medical speaking or if it goes further.

Gabriel

- you have a good case but be nervous
- so you kind of fell apart during the rebuttal portion of your 1st speech - you don't give enough substantial evidence for this
- sign post - tell me where you are on the flow
- I'm not sure what your hypothetical is trying to say

get a timer :-)

**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.

You are contradicting yourself a lot - go down the flow

4/6 see in final speech

Aff wins based off solid attacks to contentions without significant refutation from the neg. While the neg independently made some interesting and valid points, it was too difficult ~~to~~ to follow organizationally. The Aff wins on the need to give autonomy to 14 → 18 year olds.

Room: Trailer 6  
Start: 1:50 PM  
JV Lincoln-Douglas

4

Bailey, Lucas

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Northwest Guilford AY		Marist LM	
Anna Yang	_____	Liam Mullican	_____

Winner: Marist LM debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team  
Signature: [Signature] [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BME

**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.