

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College JW

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Jasmine Walker

26

NEG

St James GK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Gibeom Kim

27

Winner: St James GK debating on the Neg Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Laura Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Word for word same case as the last opp.
- Roadmap before you talk.
- 1AR is a hard speech — After attacking opp. case you should reiterate your own & stress your strong points
- Respond to opponents attack on your case
- Not saying "you need my value for their value" isn't a strong value debate
- ~~Attacking value~~
- Need more offensive points

Neg

- Same
- Work on specifically attacking opp. arguments during NR — go down the flow
- Have a value of justice ready when asked for it
- Good roadmap
- Good job summarizing the round

↑ Expect same debate as last round

Same for both debaters

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

SandHoke Early College BJ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Brenna Johnson

NEG

St James JG

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Jason Grate

Winner: SandHoke Early College BJ debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Laura Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Really needed you to speak up - hard to hear esp. w/ loud air conditioning
- Make more eye contact during speech - hold the paper away from your face so it doesn't block you
- Def - don't attack a def unless there is a reason behind that attack. 14-18 is a standard def of adolescent

Neg

- Need a clear definition of Justice ready to go if it is your value
- No new arguments in the NR
- Give voters - good job summarizing, but make it clear you are giving voters
- Watch saying "contusion" v "critteron"

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 (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Cary NJ		Northwest Guilford AW	
Noah Jabusch	<u>28</u>	Alex White	<u>28</u>

Winner: Alex - Northwest Guilford debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The NEG provided a slightly better defense of his position with logical flow. Neither side seemed properly prepared to defend critiques of their respective contentions. Responses on both sides became vague and unsubstantiated. The AFF's framework seemed slightly non-sequitur to the criterion set. The 1st Contention was more of an example that should have been added to the 2nd contention. ~~and the 2nd Contention~~

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

Marist MC

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Northwest Guilford HC

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Mackenzie Childs

Haleigh Cadd

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

Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

While both sides provided well structured arguments for their own cases, only the AFF argued against the points presented by the opposition. That is to say, the NEG conceded all pts. in the NC. Given this, only the AFF's framework supported the Value & Criterion. on speaking points,

The AFF spoke quickly, but was engaging and made good eye contact. The NEG spoke to an imaginary audience engaging neither the opponent or the judge.

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

SandHoke Early College AB

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Austin Bell

NEG

Pinecrest AE

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Anire Egbe

Winner: SandHoke AB debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff is non-unique but the neg fails to point this out.

Overall, the aff evidence suggests that transgender youth is a large issue, which can be addressed through affirming and which causes a large amount of suffering. Neg evidence only talks about PFC development, not actual decision-making.

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 NK

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Nicholas Kyle

NEG

Cary EK

POINTS
(0-30)

25

Enoch Kuan

Winner: Sandhoke NK debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

While the affirmative case is non-unique, the negative fails to point this out and never shows why adolescents are better served by being left to suffer in mental anguish for to regress-

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

Thomas Jefferson HSST NB

Naman Baraya

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Asheville IG

Iize Greever

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSST NB debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Naman -
good job at pushing evidence in CX
Its not an argument to say they said this, but they didn't do it either
did a great job in AR1
not sure why you didn't discuss

Iize -
don't be so hostile in CX - its unbecoming
- you don't actually provide any substantial arguments against the Aff - you attempt to criticize validity but you don't do this well and he answers you
- your counter in 2 is interesting but its not providing us with a warrant to buy it
- I need you to refer to evidence in AR2 - you do this w/ CX not w/

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'm voting Aff for a few reasons
- the debate flow asked who gave more lines - the aff gave more lines
= the ~~neg~~ constructive provided insufficient arguments - full value value
- insufficient answer to Aff constructive

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Henry W. Grady AO

POINTS

(0-30)

30

NEG

Cary OS

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

Alex Opasaht

Oonagh Stevans

Winner: Grady AO School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Alex -

I like this idea - but
clin left wondering: what is
the height for the lowest
age we can go... not sure if
it will be relevant how they

- Don't let her ask questions
in your CX

Oonagh -

Reflexively, I'm not convinced
adults are somehow able to make
autonomous decisions - Although, I'm
a hard determinist.

~~_____~~
clin not sure what their rights
are that justice is wrong -

Not an argument to say that "use
your argument against yourself."
- there is a difference between meta
analysis very reasonable/probably/soundly
as opposed to just one of them.

what is just is just - is not an 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 | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

SIC - think justice requires

clin voting aff for a few reasons

- I buy the arguments proposed by the aff that we must protect the negative self rights if no difference is seen
- The neg. doesn't adequately prove that adolescents are categorically different and fails to respond to the metaanalysis evidence
- I think the most convincing arguments made by the negative is one that relates to determinism (adolescents aren't actually making choices because they are covered primarily by parents) - I might have bought arguments based on this idea.
- Therefore to prevent slavery - I vote aff.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Cary JT		Henry Clay SA	
Justin Tunley	<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? _____

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg was awarded the win largely due to how she linked with her value. The topicality of Health was brought up and Aff never convinced me that ~~Health~~ Justice was more relevant than health in this round. Neg also highlighted a contradiction in the Aff Case; having safeguards to prevent harms goes against the very nature of autonomy. Aff also did not disprove CI from the neg case, which regarded how competent adolescents are at making decisions

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 BS

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Bennett Stillerman

NEG

Cary CF

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Chelsea Fang

Winner: Providence BS School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote for the affirmative due to his linkage & the value framework. AFF provided multiple cards ~~overwhelming~~ that gave clear numbers that displayed the impacts of no autonomous medical choices. The impacts provided by the neg case were also strong, but lacked the warrants that affirmative had.

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 AM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Alysson Miller

27

NEG

Ardrey Kell AM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Anna Marsicano

28

Winner: Ardrey Kell AM debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - You have lots of potential -
Stick with it! You need

to better defend your case

You added arguments in your last

Speech, which were good arguments, but you need to

do that early. - You need to uphold autonomy for all
+ should not hold it to life/death decisions

NEG- Nice job, - rebuttal about

- You should have mentioned the
inability to change your mind after gender
re-assignment surgery.

Need to explain familial attachments argument -

No link

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 13 Min CX
12 Min Neg 13 Min CX 14 Min 1AR 1
6 Min NR 13 Min 2AR 14 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Gullford AY

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Anna Yang

28

NEG

Providence SZ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Sunny Zhang

29

Winner:

Providence SZ
Sunny Zhang

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

no

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff- need to know info about your sources:

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.

Neg- Great refutations!

The whole experience of adult argument did not work well for either side.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Thomas Jefferson HSST RM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Rachel Ma

27

NEG

Marist LM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Liam Mullican

28

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

Signature: Marcia Long

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC: Your 1st Contention has no ends based impact; not really fully of consequence. 2nd Contention is more about their inherent worth & ability

NC: The fact that your VC is vague is not beneficial for weighing the Road; more warrants or some warrants would be nice

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.

1AR: Instead of just saying "Extend Smith '07," explain the impact!! ~~the~~ Just saying "extend" does not show strong argumentation. Hard to understand your attack on his 3rd Contention; try not to mumble and fizzle out.

in the framework. If you make a claim of fact such as dysfunctional families hurt rationality, you should have some evidence.

2AR: Again, a lot of unclear "extend"s, but no clear impacts or coherent analysis of the Road. Work on clarity and presenting more meaningful arguments - obviously you are very intelligent - just slow down a little so you

1AR: Try to signpost better; Be careful - you say she should not matter roads that aren't about medical choices but you use the analogy of rationality in legal system (us vs decision). Overall, strong analysis!! Good turn on "experiments"

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Guilford CD

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Capri D'Souza

28

NEG

Asheville EH

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Eli Hardwig

27

Winner: NW Guilford CD debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: M. Long

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff wins because Negs did not effectively refute Aff's position.

AC: Your VC of Autonomy seems like a better value - it is more vague than justice - the government often provides justice, ethics can grant you autonomy; need 2 minute left

1AR: Logic is a little flawed with the argument that because they select colleges, adolescents can make medical choices. You are effective though in pointing out that his definition of programmatic autonomy is not clear and teens do have to make life choices.

2AR: Effective extended content. Aff gave a more coherent argument.

C-Ex: Stop beating a dead horse with trying to get her to admit we have no autonomy. Sort of an abusive question

NC: I do not understand why making a medical choice such as taking chemo or such ~~as~~ could not be considered local autonomy? You are not making the distinction very clear in ref either. Ran out of time to attack her contentions effectively.

JMK: Diversity of argument needed - the idea that teens cannot have "programmatic autonomy" is becoming redundant. If autonomy is impossible, that's abusive for Aff - you need much more to open an autonomy knife. You are begging the question that adolescent cannot have autonomy. All medical choices require long term planning. At what age do we make the plan?

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

SandHoke Early College GK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Gabriel Kranenburg

NEG

Centreville BK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Brian Kim

Winner: Centreville BK debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Linda Greever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good debate Decision for Neg was able to make points that aff did not reply too that were important to the debate.

Aff needs to work on time management

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.

Room: 214
Flight 2 Start: 5:30 PM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

5

Greever, Linda

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Centreville AL

Andrew Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST AK

Amitesh Kotwal

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSSTAK debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Linda Shuren

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good close debate. Both debaters are good speakers. Final decision was made for neg - felt case was stronger than aff.

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.