

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Mount Rainier FAN	POINTS (0-30)
4	Abem Fekade-Tessema	28
2	Rahel Ambachew	27
	Vinh Nguyen	

CON

Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue SN	POINTS (0-30)
3	David Salama	28
1	Creigh Niebuhr	27

Winner: Interlake School/Team debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thomas Bacon School: Puyallup

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Rahel: good CF questions!
Practice your summary speeches
Speak up in grand cross

Creigh: fill your time, buff your case "time's not important, results are"
Speak up in grand cross

Abem: good job at turning arguments and quick responses.
be careful with who's lives matter type's of arguments.
In crossfire you asked if he was aware of aerial tactics and he didn't bring it up. Why would he? it helps your side.

David: You spent your time refuting rather inefficiently, you dropped their first CI in your rebuttal and in your final focus you barely bolstered your case.

All of you should work on buffing your cases and extending speech time.
If you can, take the first and most questions in CF.

RFD: close debate, definitely a second half shift.
sort of war on default of definition.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	NAME	POINTS (0-30)
	Annie Wright PR	
1	Jasmine Pan	25
2	Simran Rakhra	26

CON

Spkr	NAME	POINTS (0-30)
	Bellevue BD	
2 2	Michelle Brumley	24
1	Maggie Davis	26

Winner: Bellevue debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: V. Chmil School: Auburn Mountainview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Teams match well - Both very knew at this.

Annie Wright

Both speakers didn't have enough content. Spoke well but didn't convince me.

For Simran - you said "It is working" but never mentioned how.

Bellevue

Speaker 1 - great job on stating your points.

Questions were too wordy.

Second Speaker - Not enough content. You pretty much repeated what your partner said.

Maggie pulled through during summary.

Good job to both teams.
It's not easy and you guys were brave!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Mathias Foster	29
2	Shammu Meyyappan	28

CON

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
1	Tyler Wang	29
2	Simon Kang	24

Winner: Eastlake debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Eastlake

- * Very organized & clear arguments!
- * Great partnership. You guys work very well together. Always having each others back.
- * Good job pointing out what they failed to prove.
- * You guys were focused on your issue at all times.

Bellevue

- * Tyler was very prepared! Unfortunately this is a team / partnership and I felt that Simon was not prepared.
- * Failed to prove how it effect Columbus specifically.
- * Weak questions during crossfire. Need to work on taking better notes.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~PRO~~ CON

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Jeffery Liu	27
4	Michael Li	27

CON ~~PRO~~

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP	POINTS (0-30)
3	AIDAN TONEY	28
1	Flynn Peterson	28

Winner: Gig Harbor TP debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no
Signature: E Fortes School: BCA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All debaters have good cases & a strong understanding of the ideas. However, pro side had significantly more warrants to support a more diverse case. To improve, all teams should seek to develop their arguments more throughout the debate. This can be achieved by rebuilding contentions during several speeches. Don't be afraid to demand to see evidence, and then actually scrutinize it!
Spend more time linking your points to the topic!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Alex Davidson	29
1	GABRIELLA WIDER	28

CON		
Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee	28
1	Christina Wang	28

Winner: Gig Harbor DW School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ask specific Qs in crossfire + push further - once you've clarified, if it doesn't make sense to you - ask about it!
 Alex: nice logic in your speeches - you're laying it out very clearly for the judge, so kudos on that

- Rebuttal - efficiency!
 Use "outweighing" so you
 - keep your questions succinct -
 - If there's history behind PC 2.0 then probably explain that in your constructive
 - BE CLEAR!!

you are dancing around the most critical issue of clash in this debate - Pro's rebuttals barely addressed the question (my advice: come up w/ multiple reasons why CON has to defend only the converse of the resolution.

RFD Neither side wins off whether con can alter plan Colombia or not - there weren't enough args that engaged for me to vote off it.

I buy that pro outweighs - con makes claims about PC 2.0 w/ing in the long term, but w/o empirics the analysis was done by pro that the specificity of their evidence outweighs (false positive - there's no proof that PC 2.0 solves)

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Robin Javid	29
2	Kyle Johnson	29

PRO

Spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	29
2	Andy Weili Sun	29

Winner: BC BS Baek/Sun debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- your RA says effects on the future are what y'all should be debating - but ^{7/3 of} your contentions are about the past...?
- Kyle - nice job being well prepped w/ evidence + integrating it into your rebuttal
- Robin - good arg pointing out that pro assumes the peace deal will help

Kevin: good questions in cross-fire - you set up premises + got concessions really nicely. give your opponents time :) to ask

Andy:

- work on efficiency in rebuttals - cut out "um". Practice helps!
- good final focus speech - you did a good job hitting the major points

RFD

Pro - Weighing done was contingent on evidence comparison - cocaine production increasing by recent evidence - phrased as a voter in pro's focus speech, and ^{there wasn't a sufficient answer from} con as to why they outweigh even though they don't have the evidence required.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Puyallup CL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Alana Christensen	29
3	Olivia Lopez	29

CON

Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0-30)
4	Allison Bennett	27
2	Katie Pryal	26

Winner: Puyallup CL debating on the pro side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no
Signature: [Signature] School: BCA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO
Very strong case
- watch for counterexamples!
- good follow thru

CON
- good case, but needs to be more directly linked. Prove that P.C. → benefits
- Many contentions have good logic but no evidence

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0-30)
4	Helen Margolis	30
2	Eve Chinae	28

CON

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Hannah Lerman	27
3	Kenzo Starks	27

Winner: Newport MC School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thomas Bacon School: Puyallup

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Eve: I wouldn't say it's a catch all phrase for multiple fronts if it's only a military affair...

Helen: you said that your debt argument didn't need to be resolutional to have an impact...

Hannah: Make sure to access your impacts not just state stats and make an, "If it's not successful why would we quit?" those types of questions set your opponents up to strengthen their arguments.

Kenzo: don't give them potential arguments

- don't let her say that you didn't mention something in your case without a response.

RFD. I think the economy point carried the pro team over the con's impacts.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

rep
.30

PRO *Con 2nd speak.*

Spkr	BC LS	POINTS (0-30)
	Leon Li	28
	Brian Juyeong Son	29

CON *PRO 1st speak* | *prep .33*

Spkr	Puyallup DG	POINTS (0-30)
<i>33</i>	Raquel Davila	25
<i>31</i>	Tristan Gearhart	27

Winner: *BC LS* debating on the *CON* Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: *[Signature]* School: *G.H.H.S*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

→ Work on clarity in speaking (constructive)
 → Roadmap as your speaking more?
 →

- Go down their whole case in Rebuttal even if you are repeating things.

Both sides need to be more concise in responding.

- Work on background, knowledge on topic -
 - Cut in and get a question.

RFD: Gave it to the Con, clear command of the round - also had greater topic knowledge.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

2nd speaker

1st speaker

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Lina Seihee Cho	26
	Chloe Sihyeon Moon	27

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wielt	28
	Gavin Torem	29

.30
.30

.30
.30

Winner: Curtis WT debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Chadwell School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Signpost in speech's please. Especially in Rebuttal. Make sure to phase questions in CF clearly. - You need to attack everything they bring up.

Work on talking quieter to each other. Try and have more responses prepared for CF - Different sources too. In Summary distill debate down to key points.

'FD': This was an excellent Round. Impressive for novi. Even with washing out Drag production - I give the Round to Con. Con wins on Econ impact for US/Columbia

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Hannah Lerman	26
2	Kenzo Starks	27

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Alex Davidson	28
1	GABRIELLA WIDER	24

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gig-Harbor - Very organized thoughts & solid facts. Really good job at pointing out specific #'s.
Gabriella - You got this! Be a little more confident. Good job Alex on tying everything together & bringing the attention to lives matter & plan is no longer effective.

Peninsula - You guys work very well together. It sounds like you guys practiced a lot together. You had excellent points but need to focus more on specific #'s instead of saying "Violence cut in half" or "Save a lot of money."

Awsome job to both teams!!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Puyallup DG	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Raquel Davila	24
1	Tristan Gearhart	26

CON

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Jeffery Liu	28
2	Michael Li	27

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Newport - Very well prepared. Huge improvement from a month ago. Your thoughts were organized and lots of great content. Jeff - ran out of time, Michael you had left over time. Could have finished Jeff's thoughts, but overall solid facts & arguments.

Puyallup - Tristan you did great. Have more faith in yourself. You were prepared and did a good job during rebuttal. This is a partnership and your partner was not prepared. Her speech was 2 minutes short... lacked content. Spend a little more time researching & practicing together. You got this!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bellevue BD	POINTS (0-30)
2	Michelle Brumley	28
1	Maggie Davis	27

CON

Spkr	Mount Rainier FAN	POINTS (0-30)
1	Abem Fekade-Tessema	26
2	Rahel Ambachew	26
	Vinh Nguyen	

Winner: Bellevue BD debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Columbia is causing the problem to grow because each small step causes more problems to spawn.
Con: Columbia is the root of the problem and is causing the problem to spread.

Con: Show more evidence for your claims; hard to give weight to an argument when I don't have the statistics/reasons that show why it is important

~~What I see as the main:~~
Push main points hard!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

speakers second 1:30

1:38

PRO

Spkr	Interlake HS SN	POINTS (0-30)
2	David Salama	27
1	Creigh Niebuhr	27

CON

Spkr	BC LS con	POINTS (0-30)
1	Leon Li	28
2	Brian Juyeong Son	29

Winner: BC LS debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

- it is more convincing if you look at me!
- take into account his arg about overtime stats for coke production
- I don't see how the Bolivia comparison is pertinent

* please sign post a little more! it was hard to follow the order of your args on the flow

con

- good navigation of the conflicting evidence of drug production
- "well you can stop saying "we strongly believe" or "what we are saying here" because it uses extra time"
- excellent work in crossfire

Brian

Both: I think the past/present/future distinction isn't important, it's more about long vs. short term

I need you to weigh between your impacts so it's easier

David, you might want to weigh in your 1st speech

PLEASE weigh your impacts in your speech!!!

I don't think debating about the topicality of PC 20 is the best use of your time

David: insofar as you tell me so nothing isn't implemented yet, I still can't vote for you if that any that fact is relevant in the round.

I voted con:

- ① weighing mech helped me vote
- ② pro didn't tell me what to do w/ args at all

Leon

nice job, Leon!

-if you're going to only go for 1 arg, tell me why it's the most important

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

1:50

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP <i>con</i>	POINTS (0-30)
1	AIDAN TONEY	28
2	Flynn Peterson	28

CON

1:50

Spkr	Puyallup CL <i>pro</i>	POINTS (0-30)
1	Alana Christensen	30
2	Olivia Lopez	29

Winner: Puyallup CL debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

Alana: hold your laptop when you speak so it's more convincing + even to make eye contact w/ judge
 → makeup on point to the

Olivia: you good rebuttal! so many blocks!
 makes sure you tell me why lives > econ.
 seems intuitive, but tell me anyway.
 (in other words, tell me why you o/weigh)
 (not just how)

Lana: good application of your C2 to econ!
 you need to tell me how why you outweigh.
 (like, it's implied that you create bigger economic benefit but need you to say it).
 try to cover the con flow more, try dropped alot of your args

CON

Aidan: you sound awesome if you slow down a little + actually speaking more productively. you end up
 → talk to your caps. about speaking drills
 → you two are dapper at

Flynn: try to cover more! you can probably skip the "goal" arg — make sure to focus on your own case. try dumped args on your flow

Aidan: ~~try to drop~~
 maybe make more extensions and please give me a way to weigh!!

Flynn: you're very articulate in crossfire
 try not to just rehash the arguments you made before

Voting:
 I voted pro b/c

- ① burden of columbia better off is net
- ② only pro extended any offense

③ only pro gave me a weighing mech/

GREAT DEB

Flynn es Flynn
 undermining
 focus
 during final focus
 also, Aidan
 packing up
 arguments for weighing

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **First**

Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0-30)
3	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee	26
1	Christina Wang	35

CON **Second**

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
4	Mathias Foster	27
2	Shammu Meyyappan	27

Winner: Eastlake FM School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no.

Signature: [Signature] School: Curtis H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON →

- 1) improves lives of Columbians ✓
- 2) decrease production of drug. ✓

inefficient, expensive, collateral impact
 still largest producer

↓
 human rights disaster
 ecological disaster

There is peace... agreement signed

Christina = little more clarity on the points you are arguing

Lauryn - be careful of hasty conclusions and don't mix correlation and causation
 did you consider P.C. 1.0 is inevitable

So, to both teams: what, specifically, is Plan Columbia supposed to accomplish?

Mathias good calm - 2.0 not necessarily being better than 1.0

Do accept 2.0 peace, argot; but at what cost?

RFD ⇒ PRO Shows costs of Plan Columbia outweigh benefits. Can never convince P.C. 2.0 will be implemented over P.C. 1.0.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

CON **2**

spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0-30)
2	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	25
4	Andy Weili Sun	25.5

PRO **1**

spkr	Annie Wright PR	POINTS (0-30)
3	Jasmine Pan	25
1	Simran Rakhra	24

Winner: BC BS School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no.

Signature: [Signature] School: Curtis H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro - Abs. all of your time to explain the link between your claim and the article. 2:54

Con - good use of data - explain more fully how it supports your case. 2:50

Simran - ayea - use all your time - only used 2:22 take the question & defend your case

Andy - also use all time. good, clear presenter, needs more development.

both sides - use all 4 minutes of your speaking speech

a lot of figures bandied about by both sides - neither really show causal link ultimately. Con was slightly more organized, and thus persuasive

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Connor Wielt	27
2	Gavin Torem	29

CON

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Helen Margolis	27
2	Eve Chinae	28

Winner: Newport MC debating on the CON Low point win?

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Be nicer in crossex!
- Let them answer!!!

Listen to your opponent's speeches
- You both miss a lot of things the other team said and then saying "they didn't mention"

Curtis: Push impacts harder!

Newport: Be

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastlake LC	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Raj Lakhani	28
4	Alexander Clarke	29

CON

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Lina Seihee Cho	26
3	Chloe Sihyeon Moon	27

Winner: Eastlake LC debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO
School/Team

Signature: Charles Rusk School: Mount Rainier

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The debate got bogged down a lot in actual Hectares of land being used and neither side was able to show an increase or decrease in overall production due to the land size.

The debate came down for Morality + Economy. While the ~~AFF~~^{NEG} was able to prove that the economy was growing, it didn't do enough to tie it to Plan Colombia while the AFF called the morality of the whole plan in to question

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Allison Bennett	29
3	Katie Pryal	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Robin Javid	27
4	Kyle Johnson	28

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Charles Rusk School: MT. Rainer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The ~~PRO~~ PRO side had many valid arguments but were unable to prove any significant harm overall. The harm they were trying to prove was mostly taken by the point that FARC has signed a peace treaty with Colombia which they were unable to refute.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Newport RS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Ravneet Ranu	25
2	Casey Schoonover	26

CON

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
2	Tyler Wang	25
1	Simon Kang	24

Winner: NEWPORT RS School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: RAISBECK AVIATION HS

THE NEWPORT TEAM ~~USED~~ USED MORE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THEIR CONTENTIONS,
 Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ADVERSE HEALTH EFFECTS
- HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION
- INCREASES POVERTY
- SHIFTED POWER FROM COLOMBIANS TO MEXICANS
- HASN'T CHANGED THE DRUG FLOW
- PEOPLE ACHEIVED
- COCAINE'S PRICE STABILITY IS EVIDENCE OF PLAN COLOMBIA'S FAILURE

- PROVIDED A STABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN U.S. & COLOMBIA
- STRENGTHENED COLOMBIAN GOVT.
- HAS SOLVED PROBLEMS
- OVER-DOSED GLYPHOSATE, BECAUSE OF AERIAL SPRAYING
- UNDERCUT OWN ARGUMENT ON AERIAL SPRAYING

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) 1

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Hannah Lerman	29
2	Kenzo Starks	28

2 (Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Jeffery Liu	27
1	Michael Li	28

Winner: NEWPORT LL School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? YES

Signature: Eric Anderson School: GIG HARBOR

Comments & Reason for Decision:

4 4 ~~3~~ 4 4 3 2 2 3 2 2

2 prep ~~PRO~~ CON
 2 prep

PRO ~~CON~~

1ST-HANNAH
 -GOOD CROSS FIRE

1ST MICHAEL
 -GREAT PACING

..KENZO
 I DON'T SEE ANY REASON TO GO OVER
~~THE~~ YOUR OWN CASE WHEN THEY
 HAVEN'T EVEN TOUCHED YOURS YET
~~THEY~~ -GREAT JOB REFUTING

2 JEFFERY
 -GREAT WEIGHING ON CON'S CONTENTIONS

FD:
 BURGINS MADE ME ~~WORTH~~
~~THE CON AT HA~~ ON THE

NOTE NEG BK OF THE DEBATE
 JOBS V LIVES DEBATE. GOOD ROUND!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

S/NOT END PLAN

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0-30)
<u>3</u>	Lina Seihee Cho	27
<u>4</u>	Chloe Sihyeon Moon	29

S/END PLAN

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
<u>1</u>	Tyler Wang	29
<u>2</u>	Simon Kang	27

Winner: BC Academy debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: Helen Boyer School: Newport

CLOSE DEBATE! GOOD WORK BOTH SIDES.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lina
 1) good to define plan. *organisations*
 2) Plan Columbia s/be altered.
 CONT 1) STABILIZES economy.
 ↑ middle class growth - good pt.
 "strategic" - pronounce correctly.
 CONT 2) effectively combated drug production.
 good Q re immigration
 rebutted:
 displaced persons - need ongoing U.S. help.
 Peace agmt did not solve all problems.
 No statistics re coca production.
 DID NOT refute middle class growth argument.
 2d spkr cross: Effective use of data.
 Lina
 good pt that goals NOT yet met.
 watch your time - over by ~ 20 sec.
 Chloe: final focus
 good DATA re reduction of "drug economy," and loss of habitat.
 displaced persons - + weight

Tyler
 1) Plan now ↓ tra T to Col.
 Round up use. - good Argu (+)
 2) Abuse - sexual, military
 2) What? minimize, select. Be clear *what point is.* + good use of Wash Post *Post*
 3) \$: little to no effect in improving *some* cond'ns.
 [GOOD DATA]
 and Tyler cross:
 good answer that amt of coca still went up.
 + Good form - asks if you may have (+)
 Question.
 Good answer re *why you* based comparison (+)
 on 1998 - you maintained
 your composure and had good data
 Simon *TIP*
 ASK if others are ready before you START.
 Columbia is #1 producer of coca.
 CONTIN 1) Immigration scattered *PARC*
 2) Peace Treaty - US was not part.
 3) \$ - little to no effect in ↑ conditions.
 TIP: you don't need to say "clearly" if your point is clear. Just state it.
 Tyler Sunny: middle class rising - good pt (+)
 that supports your case.
 Good quote re data - but it be better to have data, i
 Simon - Find
 TRY NOT to overstate your points.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

s/NOT end Plan - effective.

(Circle One) PRO CON

AF: US spend Plan Colombia

PRO	CON	(Circle One)
Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0-30)
1	Allison Bennett	25
2	Katie Pryal	25

Spkr	Mount Rainier FAN	POINTS (0-30)
1	Abem Fekade-Tessema	25
2	Rahel Ambachew	25
N/A	Vinh Nguyen - Not competing	

Winner: Eastlake BP debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen Boyer School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Define - good D TO ASSIST in combatting viol. US & COL suffer

1) HARMS COL
 + violence - guerrillas paramilitary
 + Guardian - good source
 + civilians - covered up as planned mil. death.

2) HARMS US
 1) soldiers → mercenaries → soldiers → Yemen + NYTIMES
 "source Isaac on 'Don Walla Walla' is NOT a good citation."
 2) cocoa cultivation 7-2014-15

Abem
 effective PLAN effective.
 1) stabilized economy.
 TIP: STAND STILL.
 2) reduced violence & crime
 3) ended civil war.
 "any indication, training & mix ctrs"
 TIP: you had more time ^(min) you could use it to provide more detail!

Abem
 You did well in X fire (1st X fire)
 Good argu that this is happen in Afghanistan too: say "not unique to Columbia".

Rahel
 - Good pt re gold mining - say "no correlation" or "no proof of causation"
 Use formal language - avoid "yeah..."
 Good pt that US is not openly condoning mercenary actions.
 Crossfire - Rahel's turn. Technical violation.

Katie
 Good argu re training of mercenary fighters against US
 civilians covered up as combat deaths - morally wrong.
 "a opportunity" → grammatically
 You had 45 sec left - use it

Abem
 stabilized econ] BBC UK good source.
 • reduced viol.
 "weight" - mercenaries.
 "weight" - be respectful in your tone in questions.
 "weight" - "not" opponents "opposers" say "you say"

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) 1

Spkr	Eastlake LC	POINTS (0-30)
1	Raj Lakhani	28
2	Alexander Clarke	28

2

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0-30)
2	Helen Margolis	15
1	Eve Chinae	25

Winner: Eastlake LC debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Eric Anderson School: GIG HARBOR

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO
Raj
ANNOUNCE A BIT MORE CLEARLY

- NICE SPEED GUYS
- ADD TAGLINES TO YOUR SUBPOINTS

CON
Eve

ALEXANDER
- YOU GUYS CLEARLY KNOW YOUR STUFF, BUT MISSING THE BURDEN STRUCTURE & ALSO CONTENTION 2'S 100,000 SUBPOINTS MEANT THEY HAD ENOUGH OFFENSE TO WIN.

- GIGGLING IN A TENSE ROUND IS PROBABLY NOT GREAT

HELEN

THIS WAS A VERY TOUGH ROUND TO JUDGE. I WENT BACK & FORTH MULTIPLE TIMES. NO ONE PROVIDED AN EASY WAY TO VOTE. BASICALLY, CON BURDEN (AN UNFAIR ONE, TOO) WENT UN TOUCHED, BUT CON ALSO ENDED UP SOLVING ITSELF OUT OF OFFENSE BECAUSE IT SEEMS THAT LASTING STABILITY HAS BEEN BROUGHT VIA PEACE WITH FARC. AT THAT POINT, I'M LEFT W/D A COMPELLING REASON TO KEEP PLAN C. ANY MORE, SO PRO ACTUALLY MEETS THE

BURDEN. I WAS VOTING CON HARD UP UNTIL THE LAST 2 SPEECHES, BUT EXTENDING FARC PEACE CHANGED MY MIND. SOLID DEBATE!

Room: 714
Flight 2 Start: 7:30 PM
Novice Public Forum

3

Swanson, Keith

Raisbeck Aviation

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup CL	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Alana Christensen	30
	Olivia Lopez	30

Spkr	Bellevue BD	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Michelle Brunley	
	Maggie Davis	

Winner: Puyallup debating on the _____ Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Raisbeck Aviation HS
FORFEIT

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO (Circle One) CON

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Leon Li	26
2	Brian Juyeong Son	25

con

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Mathias Foster	26
2	Shammu Meyyappan	26

Winner: EASTLAKE FM debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: RAISBECK AVIATION HS

THEY USED THEIR SOURCES MORE EFFECTIVELY?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NO EFFECTIVENESS ON DRUG WAR
 - PRICE UNCHAINED
 6 MIL SEEKING REPARATIONS FROM GOVT.
 HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BY US BACKED GOVT.
 MILITARY BALANCE RESULTS.
 HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS: OUTWEIGH DRUG-REDUCTION
 → INTERRUPTED ANSWERS/TALKED OVER DURING CROSSFIRE 2
 - QUESTIONING EVIDENCE VALIDITY
 SOME THINGS IN FINAL SPEECH WOULD HAVE BEEN USED BETTER EARLIER ON.

HAS REDUCED DRUG-PRODUCTION
 GOVT IS STABILIZED
 HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE
 USED MORE RECENT EVIDENCE THAT IT HAS REDUCED DRUG WAR
 GOVT ONLY CAPABLE BECAUSE OF PC SUPPORT
 STOPPED FARE, KEEP IT TO STOP OTHERS

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee	28
1	Christina Wang	28

Spkr	Puyallup DG	POINTS (0-30)
2	Raquel Davila	26
1	Tristan Gearhart	27

Winner: BC LW debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastlake

Comments & Reason for Decision: Prep - 1*

PRO

- 1) Outdated - Military - peace has been established
 - 2) Failed to end cocaine production
- Murder thousands
 Same level of production

Counters → Human rights argument
 Provides Democracy does not mean the economy → weaker correlation

Don't get too excited, you are a good presenter and don't need to increase your volume too much.

CON

Prep - 1

- 1) Human rights help people from violence by Farc
- 2) Provides Democracy →
 - 1) Increased military strength

Does not counter very effectively

✓ Good point on peace treaty not meaning peace is guaranteed reduction in Columbia

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0-30)
2	Connor Wielt	27.1
4	Gavin Torem	28.1

Spkr	Newport RS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Ravneet Ranu	27.6
3	Casey Schoonover	28.6

Winner: Newport RS School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Newport made coherent speeches. ~~and~~
 Most importantly, Newport was able to discredit arguments that seemed correlated, but not causated / caused.
 Curtis' Newport impact calculus.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Robin Javid	28.3
4	Kyle Johnson	28.4

Spkr	Annie Wright PR	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Jasmine Pan	26.4
1	Simran Rakhra	26.5

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Derek Tsang School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gig Harbor made more coherent speeches, with updated cards, and responded with clear and relevant answers.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	26
3	Andy Weili Sun	20

Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Alex Davidson	28
2	GABRIELLA WIDER	27

Winner: GIG DW School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madis Thibodeau School: Aub. Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- constructive was 49 sec short
- enunciate more
- Rebuttal was 2 min short
- 2nd speaker needs to be more active in CX

- enunciate more in constructive

~~Madis~~

I voted for con mainly because they were able to prove lives saved & quality of life improved, as well as increase in econ.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Interlake HS SN	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	David Salama	26
2	Creigh Niebuhr	26

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	AIDAN TONEY	28
1	Flynn Peterson	29

Winner: GIGA TP School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: Madison Thibodeau School: Aub. Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision: - Do not face one another in CX

- 1 min short on constructive
- watch your facial expressions + language
- Rebuttal was 1 min short

- Rebuttal was 40 seconds short

I voted PRO due to the fact ~~they~~ they proved lives saved & ~~was~~ a counterplan to Aid w/o Plan Columbia

Schumaker, 99

Room: 719
Flight 2 Start: 9:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

4

~~Memon, Abdul~~

Interlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Connor Wielt	25
2	Gavin Torem	24

Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Allison Bennett	23
2	Katie Pryal	22

Winner: ~~son~~ Curtis WT debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature:  School: 99

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON
come on don't wear a polo & tie.

PRO

ultimately the pro side was reduced down to merc's in Yemen & illegal mining. I'm not convinced those are major issues within the context of the debate. While harmful effects are bad the major points made by the con side go essentially unrefuted. Merc's are ultimately a small issue. Con points out that illegal mining is going down as is drug production, both points unrefuted by the other side.

Schumaker, 99

4

~~Memon, Abdul~~

~~Interlake~~

Room: 719
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Lina Seihee Cho	23
2	Chloe Sihyeon Moon	25

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Hannah Lerman	22
2	Kenzo Starks	24

Winner: BC CM School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? N

Signature: [Signature] School: 99

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO Major decision is that the primary motivation for keeping plan Colombia hinges on jobs and the economy. The decision to repeal points out rightly that jobs/free trade isn't the only goal of the plan. Pro points out that the plan has either already succeeded or it has failed, a point which goes essentially unrefuted.

CON

Both sides work on memorizing speeches and speaking to the judge; not just reading off of the page.

2 min prep

4
4
3
4
4
3
2
2
3
2
2

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:30 pt left

1:40 pt left

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Robin Javid	22
2	Kyle Johnson	28

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Jeffery Liu	24
2	Michael Li	27

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Bryan Kimura School: Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The second speakers for both teams were pretty close in their positions, but the win came down to their first speaker. Newport's 1st speaker asked more effective questions.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Helen Margolis	21
2	Eve Chinae	29

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	AIDAN TONEY	27
1	Flynn Peterson	20

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Bearman School: Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Newport clearly were more confident when speaking. This caused the other team to noticeably doubt themselves.

4
4
3
4
4
3
2
2
3
2
2

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

<input checked="" type="radio"/> PRO	<input type="radio"/> CON	(Circle One)	POINTS (0-30)
Spkr	Puyallup CL		
1	Alana Christensen		28
2	Olivia Lopez		28 <i>ll</i>

<input checked="" type="radio"/> CON	<input type="radio"/> PRO	(Circle One)	POINTS (0-30)
Spkr	Eastlake LC		
1	Raj Lakhani		28
2	Alexander Clarke		29

Winner: Eastlake LC School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Lesly Lam School: Redmond

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Alana - Clear organized case. Nice speaking voice.

Olivia - great rebuttal speech! However during questioning grand cross. Victimized is not displaced. I'm not convinced.

Questioning I feel that pro lost due to inability to answer questions

Raj - great speaking voice. Case good and organized. though you lost me during your summary.

Alex - excellent speaker, very organized systematic

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	28
2	Andy Weili Sun	27

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Bellevue BD	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Michelle Brumley	28
1	Maggie Davis	29

Winner: Bellevue BD School/Team debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Wesley Lam School: Redmond

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Michelle & Maggie great prepared speeches. Maggie speaks with passion though I found Michelle's stance and tone off putting. Both speakers remained poised during questioning nice 😊. you are well informed of the resolution. nice work.
prep time should be taken before speaking not before questioning.

Kevin and Andy
Clear case however seemed to read the case with out looking up.
familiarize yourself with the case. so you can make eye contact.
please be mindful of etiquette and ask if judge and opponents are ready.

Try to strategically guess about questions you might be able to ask. I feel this time was not used wisely.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Interlake HS JCD	POINTS (0-30)
1	Amy Jiang	29
	Monica Connell	
3	Archika Dogra	29 30

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Bella Galbiati	29
4	Denney James	30

Winner: Kingston GJ School/Team _____ debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Resolution: The US should end plan Columbia.

Awesome Round on both sides w/ confident speakers :))

Con won bc [mostly framework w/ safety emph]

- showed that HR violations mostly from FARC & not Columb. gov.
- Pro did really well still w/ HR viol framework. Should have expanded maybe on spray & how many ppl killed from that as well?
- Coca Distrib point I gave to pro
- Pro tie in how increase coca produc. would increase HR violations bc CON'S stats on ↓ violations was

from 2000-2005 when coca went down but in 2015 production went up by 52% !!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1st.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

2nd

Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee 1	26
	Christina Wang 2	25

Spkr	Interlake HS SN	POINTS (0 - 30)
	David Salama 1	25
	Creigh Niebuhr 2	26

Winner: Interlake HS SN debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Cristina

end early in summer 4
 restate your teams contentions
 if short - use time.
 dont admit failure.

Lauryn

cross fire
 is not meant for new or
 explanation of contentions
 not speech - for gesturing.
 + good organization!

Both

- dont look & point at ea other
- ask questions & move on, dont interrupt.
- dont let team ask more than 2 in a row to even out ?'s.

Creigh

good summary & organized.
 be considered in speaking.

David use time left
 1:39 on rebuttal.
 + good organization in F.Focus

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1st

(Circle One) PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	BC LS	POINTS (0-30)
	Leon Li 1	29
	Brian Juyeong Son 2	27

(Circle One) PRO CON (Circle One) 2nd

Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0-30)
	Alex Davidson 2	28
	GABRIELLA WIDER 1	24

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: WHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

+ Strong arguments.
 - stick to format of debate.
 Prep not intended for crossfire watch time.
 - Interrupting response to questions in cross fire
 - watch degrading comments "do you realize what I'm saying"
 + would have won, strong arguments but stay w/in the frame w/ of debate.

+ good keeping center focus through debate
 - keep organized in F.Fours when frazzled.
 - Gabby - more prepared for cross fire.
 + Alex help teammate when not preparing to wk together.
 - polish arguments in Rebuttal FF

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Puyallup DG	POINTS (0-30)
2	Raquel Davila	25
1	Tristan Gearhart	25

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
2	Tyler Wang	29
1	Simon Kang	28

Winner: Bellevue School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: SKHS

30 sec 30 sec

1:30 sec
18 sec

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① 1. Plan Colombia was underfunded
 2. Removal of coca damages other crops caused health probs
 3. Govt failure, Colombia is still #1 producer
 peace has not reached 5 secs left

— cross: did not ask many q's

②. Points out failure of Plan Colombia
 2:30 left

① 1. Plan Colombia has proven it stabilizes and can improve relations with US
 2. Decrease in violent crimes
 3. cly removed, other cartels will be unregulated
 50% drop in cocaine from Colombia

— cross: how would Plan Colombia's removal benefit?
 too many rhetorical q's
 cross is for q's, not statements

② Funding should increase, not decrease, more effective changes.
 aerospray was eliminated in 2012
 20-15% effective
 one peace treaty doesn't equal all
 don't know if peace deal will be successful

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Newport RS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Ravneet Ranu	27
2	Casey Schoonover	28

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Mathias Foster	27
2	Shammu Meyyappan	27

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: SKHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Chemical agents can cause cancer
 2. Decrease in production
 3. Peace has been reached
 Know specific dates if referenced
 Cross: cocaine production hasn't ceased enough

② 1. ~~USA~~ - cocaine #'s is the same, proves plan Colombia isn't impactful
 2. War on drugs causes death and destruction of life
 3. Economic impact - 41% poverty, removing cocaine has not repaired the economy
 Cross: didn't prove it caused cancer

① 1. plan Colombia was successful / has stabilized
 2. Reduced violence lowest rate in 40 years
 FARC was reduced half
 Cross: nice point that cancer isn't documented enough for a claim

② 1. usage of glyphosate is not condoned by Colombia, 1st contention is disproven
 2. Plan Colombia is still needed until cocaine isn't #1
 3. other groups still exist and need to be dealt with
 Cross: Valid point about specific evidence about cancer

25 Sec

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

30 seconds Used
30 seconds Used

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0-30)
4	Helen Margolis	27
2	Eve China	26

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Mathias Foster	25
3	Shammu Meyyappan	24

Winner: Newport MC School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Dont use crossfire time to argue semantics or just to try to make your oponent look stupid. Spend time trying to clarify contentions and ask about evidence.

During oponent speeches try not to talk so loudly as it is very distrating.

Make sure to use all speech time even if you have to reiterate what you said previously. I thought that both cases could have each easily had another contention.

I voted for pro this round because they were the only team to carry a single impact through the round.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

lot speak

38 seconds used

2nd speak

30 sec used

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Eastlake LC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Raj Lakhani	28
3	Alexander Clarke	29

Spkr	Newport RS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Ravneet Ranu	27
4	Casey Schoonover	30

Winner: Eastlake LC School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

By far the best novice round I've judged. Both teams were extremely prepared and all spoke excellently.

Newport made good use of framework and burden but was too insistent with it throughout CX. Just because the other team doesn't use the word "Framework" doesn't mean they don't have one.

I chose to vote pro this round because they were able to carry their contention one through while also providing excellent refutation to the Cons framework.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Bellevue BD	POINTS (0-30)
1	Michelle Brumley	27
2	Maggie Davis	26

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Jeffery Liu	25
2	Michael Li	26

Winner: BELLEVUE BD debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Rainier Aviators

Comments & Reason for Decision: BELLEVUE WAS SLIGHTLY BETTER AT HAVING FACTS AT HAND AND RESPONDING TO RAINIER CROSSFIRE.

- 30% decrease in rural poverty
- reduction in drug trade directly correlates to aid.
- strengthened the govt.
- admitted some police misconduct
- cocaine production and use cause more deaths than spraying.
- Colombia not strong enough yet.

- ~~not~~ not used as intended
- military using ~~it~~ for own ends
- no steady decrease in coca production
- violates human rights
- going to death squads; paramilitary
- inflating body count
- fuels conflict
- coca production increasing
- war crime
- displaced over 5 million people

4
4
3
4
4
3
2
2
3
2

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Alex Davidson	25
1	GABRIELLA WIDER	25

Spkr	Puyallup CL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Alana Christensen	29
2	Olivia Lopez	28

Winner: Puyallup CL debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Rainier Aviation

PUYALLUP USED SPECIFIC DATA AND MORE PRECISE ARGUMENTS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- INCREASED STABILITY AND INTERNAL SECURITY
- ECONOMY IMPROVING
- STILL HAS IMPORTANT PROGRAMS IT'S FUNDING
- ASKED ABOUT ARGUMENTS
- PNC HAS BEEN HELPFUL
- PLAN COLUMBIA IN A VACUUM? EFFECTS ARE BECAUSE OF COLUMBIAN GOVT.
- OVERALL VIOLENCE GOING DOWN
- IT WOULD BE WORSE WITHOUT PC

- ← CONTRIBUTE TO PREG COMBAT DRUGS ← NOT ACHIEVED
- DIRECT CORRELATION BETWEEN AID & EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS
- REWARDS BASED ON # OF KILLS
- TRAINING SOLDIERS THEN WORKING AS MERCENARIES IN THE WHOLE EAST.
- AFFECTING NOT JUST COCA, BUT AGRICULTURAL CROPS
- SHARP QUESTIONING
- COLUMBIAN GOVT. AFFECTED DRUG TRADE W/OUT PC
- PEACE ACHIEVED

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	26
2	Andy Weili Sun	27

Spkr	Interlake HS SN	POINTS (0-30)
2	David Salama	30
1	Creigh Niebuhr	27

Winner: Interlake HS SN School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joseph Hyink School: PCCS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BC - Pro - 1st Practice saying, "hectares."
Interlake - Con - 2nd

- Give me a way to weigh the impacts of the harms of Plan Colombia.
- Consider using prop before Rebuttal
- Don't just argue in crossfire - ask questions
- Don't just read evidence - summarize and explain how it supports your point.

- Sort of a short case.
- Don't give so many specific numbers about hectares - summarize
- Make sure you link the decreased cocaine use in the US to Plan Colombia. How do I know the it ~~is~~ is PC that caused the decrease.
- Good research with lots of good specifics.

- Con shows overall, bigger impacts rather than local ones (with smaller scope).
- Con shows better understanding of the topic and evidence.
- Con attempts to show impacts within the US.
- Con shows need for Plan Colombia to implement peace deal.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0-30)
1	Lina Seihee Cho	27 27
2	Chloe Sihyeon Moon	28

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Robin Javid	27
1	Kyle Johnson	27

Winner: BC CM School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joseph Hyink School: PECS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con - BC - 1st Say, "hectares" not "hectors"
Pro - GH - 2nd

- I really like the observations, but don't take too long on them. (but not the definition)
- Make a clearer link between Plan Colombia and the benefits you attribute to it.
- Good clear thinking to specific arguments.
- Excellent focus on the fact that PC is makeable.
- Very good, specific responses to the opponent's arguments.

- organize case better - some is repetitive
- Please weigh impacts. How big are the harms?
- Make sure you respond specifically to what Con says.
- It would help a lot to have a better grasp of the basic facts of the issue. You are off to a good start on this, but your opponent was able to answer claims you made about pretty basic facts.
- Consider using prep time sooner to strengthen earlier speeches.

Con wins

- Overall a better grasp of the topic and evidence.
- Shows a decrease in drug production overall (not just between two years).
- Shows dependence of Colombia on US and thus the necessity of continuance of the Plan

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

1:00 R

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:30 R

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0-30)
1	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee	28
1	Christina Wang	27

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
2	Tyler Wang	29
1	Simon Kang	21

Winner: Bellevue WK debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- signpost / roadmap
- don't let them steal your crossfire time by explaining - ask pointed questions looking for concessions.
- interesting framing - CBA is cost-benefit analysis, which is actually specific to monetary cost.
- the place where you lost ground on the flow was in rebuttals - rather than reiterating your original claim/appealing to pathos, take down/rebut your opponent!

- Good use of integration of evidence into your speeches
- Needs more weighing specific to evidence - is pointing out change, you should probably try to specifically compare #s, types & impacts (structural vs symptomatic)

RFD

- ~~CON~~ **CON** outweighing under CBA in 3 crucial areas -
- 1) Numbers of attacks etc. show change when we compare to #s before PC
 - 2) rising rebel groups - not enough to stop 1 group
 - 3) Peace deal not necessarily working - PRO assumes solvency

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

0:24

PRO CON (Circle One) 0:25

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0-30)
1	Allison Bennett	28
2	Katie Pryal	29

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0-30)
1	Hannah Lerman	28
2	Kenzo Starks	29

Winner: Eastlake BP School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

For both: use all speech time! time is precious. y'all are making good args, but use time to make more args

- Katie - good cx! Take the time to ask questions, not make more args.
- Allison - good job appealing to pathos by pointing out why Americans should care about PC
- Hannah - good summarization of evidence in the summary speech
- Kenzo - nice job giving a summary of the round in the Boon's speech

RFD

Pro outweighs that illegal mines owned by drug companies create more violence and Human rights violations. Other areas on the slow don't have enough weighing on them/weren't warranted enough for me to compare warrants, so I'm unable to weigh

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	BC LS	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Leon Li	20
2	Brian Juyeong Son	24

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Connor Wielt	20
4	Gavin Torem	25

Winner: CURTIS School/Team _____ debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No.

Signature: A Memon School: INTERLAKE HS.

Comments & Reason for Decision: CLOSE CALL, TEAM 2 HAD SLIGHT EDGE IN USING REFERENCES & SPEAKING WITH CONVICTION

1. GOOD REFERENCES, SPOKE WITH CONVICTION.
2. GOOD LOUD VOICE & USE OF STATISTICS.
3. GOOD VOICE. GOOD REFERENCES.
4. GOOD USE OF STATS.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

(Circle One) PRO **CON**

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP	POINTS (0-30)
2	AIDAN TONEY	25
1	Flynn Peterson	20

Spkr	Mount Rainier FAN	POINTS (0-30)
3	Abem Fekade-Tessema	25
4	Rahel Ambachew	18
	Vinh Nguyen - No show	

Winner: GIG HARBOR School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: A. Memon School: INTERLAKE HS.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* SPEAKERS OVER ALL BETTER. GOOD ~~STATS~~ REFERENCES & STATISTICS.
 SPKR 2 EXCELLENT POTENTIAL. SPOKE WITH CONVICTION. GAVE GOOD STATS.
 SPKR 1. RECOMMEND SLOW DOWN & DO NOT HESITATE.
 SPKR 3 - ~~GO~~ EXCELLENT START & TRANSITION. GOOD REFERENCES. POLISHED SPEAKER.
 SPEAKER 4 - SPEAK WITHOUT HESITATION & WITH MORE CONVICTION. BELIMINATE SELF-DOUBT. GOOD REBUTTAL. GOOD HAND GESTURES.

~~402~~ 402

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Name:		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Chenil</u>
Resolution/Topic:		Affiliation/Occupation: <u>Teacher @ AMHS</u>	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <u>Gig Kitt</u>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <u>Puyallup</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <u>Spencer Hannan</u>		<u>27</u>	Speaker 2 Name: <u>Maddie Martin</u>		<u>30</u>
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Steven Kotanskay</u>		<u>30</u>	Speaker 4 Name: <u>CT Robinson</u>		<u>29</u>

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <u>Puyallup</u>
--	----------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters: Gig Harbor

- Clear and well organized thoughts
- You mentioned moving drugs into U.S. but lacked data to support it.
- Loved the last speech, needed more of that through out.

Comments to debaters: Puyallup

- Lots of great data-factual
- Spoke with great confidence
- Used data to destroy opponents arguments
- Love the passion in Maddie.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Puyallup had a lot of solid data while gig harbor had more projections.

- 30% decrease in poverty
- 50% cocaine reduction
- Economic benefits,

Both teams spoke well, just one had a bit better facts/evidence.

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

~~402~~ 402

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Name:		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <u>J. Ruck</u>
Resolution/Topic:		Affiliation/Occupation:	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <u>GigRH</u>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <u>Pullup MR</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker #2 Name: <u>Stephen Kotansky</u>		<u>27</u>	Speaker #1 Name: <u>Madi Martin</u>		<u>27</u>
Speaker #4 Name: <u>Spencer Hannan</u>		<u>30</u>	Speaker #3 Name: <u>C.J. Robinson</u>		<u>29</u>

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <u>Pullup MR</u>
--	-----------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Stephen - Your passion for what you do is clear and appreciated. Don't let it overwhelm your speeches.

Spencer - You're the best speaker that I personally saw all tournament. Use your natural ability to connect with the Judge to your advantage in Final Focus.

Comments to debaters:

Madi - You are great at conveying the important info, but you (both) talk too fast to give proper inflection to the most important spots. Slow down just a bit.

C.J. - Your rebuttal skills are unmatched. But! ... use your Final Focus to FOCUS!

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Con appropriately showed the importance of a proven trend rather than following evidence from a single year. Con also cemented that correlation does NOT equal causation, which directly negated the Pro's evidence which was circumstantial and un-substantiated.

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

~~302~~ 402

Public Forum Debate Ballot

NATIONAL
TECH & DEBATE
ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Tournament Name:		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight:	Room: 402	Division:	Judge Name: <i>Freery</i>
Resolution/Topic:		Affiliation/Occupation: <i>Univ of Washington</i>	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <i>GigKA</i>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <i>PuyMR</i>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <i>Spencer Hannan</i>		<i>28.3</i>	Speaker 2 Name: <i>Maddy Martin</i>		<i>28.6</i>
Speaker 3 Name: <i>Steven Kotan sky</i>		<i>28.7</i>	Speaker 4 Name: <i>CS Robinson</i>		<i>28.8</i>

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <i>Puy MR</i>
--	--------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Called out other team on con vs cause & then did it yourself w/ coca production great Cx, 1st speaker needs to speak up tho or speakers get farked

Comments to debaters:

Great Cx, good use of #s let the other team answer your questions!

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I thought con won econ, human rights, & coca
Pro was ahead on US soft power but ~~the~~ con outweighs.
I didn't see enough pro numbers to give them my vote.

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

405

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Name:			Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <u>J Gutterman</u>	Affiliation/Occupation:
Resolution/Topic:				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <u>Peninsula</u>	Side: <u>CON</u>	Points:	Code: <u>Red MC</u>	Side: <u>PRO</u>	Points:
Speaker 1 Name: <u>Alex Williams</u>			Speaker 2 Name: <u>Khushi Chaudhari</u>		
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Jacob Settle</u>			Speaker 4 Name: <u>Rishva Murugan</u>		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <u>Peninsula</u>
--	-----------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

*good, clean clash and addressing of points
didn't touch on civil impact -
govt's policy of climate -
why is US system important?
rather than global
competit*

Comments to debaters:

*perhaps develop counter further -
simply say "this is not true" is
not compelling
yes, but Plan Columbia had to be fixed...
however: past failures do not imply better
in scab.*

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

*Can more clearly explain &
support their position, with
support, that Plan Columbia
provides benefit to both US &
Columbia.*

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

405

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: P. Rowland	Affiliation/ Occupation: Kingston
Resolution/ Topic: Columbia				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: Pen SW	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: Red mc	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Alex Williams			Speaker 2 Name: Khushi Chaudri		
Speaker 3 Name: Jacob Settle			Speaker 4 Name: Rishma Murugan		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: Pen SW
--	-------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

I really like how well your points dovetail to increase the strength of your arguments

Comments to debaters:

Be careful - you left some of their argument unaddressed (ex. FARC child soldiers) (ex. intel not trade w/ US)

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

more thorough argument and reacted to cross better

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

405

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Name:			Tournament Location: <i>J. High</i>		
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <i>[Signature]</i>	Affiliation/Occupation: <i>PCCS</i>	
Resolution/Topic: <i>[Signature]</i>					

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <i>Peninsula</i>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <i>Redmond MC</i>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <i>Alex Williams</i>			Speaker 2 Name: <i>Khushi Chaudri</i>		
Speaker 3 Name: <i>Jacob Settle</i>			Speaker 4 Name: <i>Rishma Murugan</i>		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <i>Peninsula</i>
--	-----------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Your links between Plan Colombia and the US economy are very weak, and the impacts (if true) are tiny.

Comments to debaters:

I'd like to hear warrants for your claims, not just evidence to back them up.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Can win:

- Weight of impacts are much greater.*

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

402

Chadwell
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location: Finals	
Round/ Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name:	Affiliation/ Occupation:
Resolution/ Topic:				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: Puy MR	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: Denin SW	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:			Speaker 2 Name:		
Speaker 3 Name:			Speaker 4 Name:		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: Puyallup MR
--	-------------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Plan Columbia is term. Peace Columbia

Comments to debaters:

the overall collegialae is the revamped version.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Voted PRO - Based on Coca Production increase in the last couple of years

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

402

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <i>Tessa LaMarea</i>	Affiliation/ Occupation: <i>ECHS</i>
Resolution/ Topic:				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <i>PMR</i>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <i>Penin JV</i>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:			Speaker 2 Name:		
Speaker 3 Name:			Speaker 4 Name:		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

*Planned columbia different from Peace columbia
Voted off the ball on effect and human rights violations that Planned columbia caused/Peace columbia solves for*

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

402

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Stevenson</u>	Affiliation/ Occupation: <u>—</u>
Resolution/ Topic:				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <u>Puy MR</u>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <u>Peninsular</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:			Speaker 2 Name:		
Speaker 3 Name:			Speaker 4 Name:		

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <u>Peninsular Puyallup</u>
--	---------------------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

PC pushes Colombian society in a militaristic direction + is responsible for HR violations - peace deal may solve and proves further support unnecessary

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 of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor TP	POINTS (0-30)
	AIDAN TONEY <i>2nd</i>	<i>28</i>
	Flynn Peterson <i>1st</i>	<i>28</i>

Spkr	BC CM	POINTS (0-30)
	Lina Seihee Cho <i>1</i>	<i>27</i>
	Chloe Sihyeon Moon <i>2nd</i>	<i>27</i>

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Chalen Kelly School: Central Kitsap

Comments & Reason for Decision:

use your prep to plan your speeches

try to pay attention to your opp. in CX use all of your time

Flynn Nice Vocabulary in case
 ↳ look to judge not opponent

Aidan good energy in beginning of case.
 work on using stronger roadmap to direct judges attention to key arguments.

When you use big vocab. be sure to clarify and explain as you go. ~~It~~ good crystallization.

* Good displacement argument
 ↳ Remember to follow up on

* Work on signposting + crystallization in an under-view to clarify voters for the judge. Yes - the killing and corruption are voters.

Why spend so much time on the question in Grand CX?

Aidan let your partner find info while you CX

Lina look to the judge not opponents
 Good CX questions

Chloe Nice clear delivery. Keep practicing to get even stronger.
 Good use of GDP #'s.

Lina good summary overview
 * please address clash of corruption *

Chloe - fluency in final speech could use work.

Funding question is a good one but does not outweigh, or the US citizens need put forward by opponent.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Pro 2nd

Spkr	Bellevue WK	POINTS (0-30)
	Tyler Wang <i>absent</i>	
	Simon Kang	26

Con 1st (Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor JJ	POINTS (0-30)
	Robin Javid <i>2nd</i>	28
	Kyle Johnson <i>2nd</i>	27

Winner: Bellevue debating on the ~~CON~~ PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? yes
 Signature: Chalen Kelley School: CKHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Simon debated alone
- good use of signposting language
- Spray argument feels unfinished because the impacts remain unclear.
- Homicide + displacement argument is strong.
- Police funding arg. is good.
- Muddy arguments in places.
- You should be more willing to ask questions in Grand CX
- speeches where covering partner appear a bit weaker than others
- yes they dropped a few key arguments - get clearer on how that matters because it does

- Robin - appears scattered
- Kyle - strong analysis + speaking
- Both need work on signposting
- Robin summary speech unclear good effort but format could help. say whose lives are impacted
- Robin - you should try to ask questions in grand to help your partner plan for final speech

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

4/4
3
2/2
3
2/2

PRO CON (Circle One) 2nd

Spkr	Newport MC	POINTS (0-30)
2nd	Helen Margolis	24
1st	Eve Chinae	26

1st (Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Interlake HS SN	POINTS (0-30)
2nd	David Salama	27
1st	Creigh Niebuhr	25

Prep used

prep used: 30 + 30 + 60

Winner: Newport MC debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Eve: clear roadmap, strong confident speaking voice. Managed cross nicely, pushed for specifics to deconstruct opponents case. Be careful not to interrupt too much & be aware of tone to maintain a respectful debate

Helen: thoroughly revisited own case point by point however adding more specific and new facts rather than just stating things are different now.

I encourage the PRO team to listen more closely to opponents as repeating questions already answered is not the most effective use of time

Creigh: well paced speaker, articulate difficult to ID/follow initial case road map or ID contentions. Would be helpful to tie questions in cross to your point/case more clearly

David: thoughtful meticulous speaker. Took care to introduce specific facts and used to counter opponents case. Your frustration show over opponents interruptions during cross. Persist to get your point across or complete your ~~own~~ answer

Both teams heavily debated CON case with less time debating the initial PRO case. Because of that, more of the PRO contentions were left unrefuted resulting in a win for the PRO side

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One) ^{1st}

(Circle One) **PRO** CON ^{2nd}

Spkr	Curtis WT	POINTS (0-30)
1st	Connor Wielt	28
2nd	Gavin Torem	29

Spkr	Eastlake FM	POINTS (0-30)
2nd	Mathias Foster	27
1st	Shammu Meyyappan	26

prep used: 15 + 30 + 55

prep used: 30 + 25 + 60

Winner: Curtis WT debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: GHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Connor: engaging speaking voice. used inflection well while also speaking quickly

Shammu: well mapped initial case. methodically presented - easy to follow.

Gavin: succinct, well mapped rebuttal speech. Strong, measured speaking voice while presenting case. Used inflection & volume well for emphasis

Mathias: thoughtful rebuttle. confident speaker, engaging speaking voice. Eye contact could add to effectiveness.

CON: Beware of too much whispering, cross talk to each other during cross.

Well argued by both teams. I appreciate the attention to the details of opponents cases to debate the facts and specifics of both cases. ~~is~~ Nicely done!

CON argued well the decrease of cocaine production with more recent evidence, the efficiency of Plan Columbia Spending vs US drug prevention spending, and recent evidence about changes in spraying practices. While PRO presented convincing arguments & rebuttles re: economic/ trade impacts and general human rights impacts. However, overall CON presented a more compelling case.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr		POINTS (0 - 30)
	Puyallup DG	
	Raquel Davila	
	Tristan Gearhart	

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr		POINTS (0 - 30)
	Annie Wright PR	
	Jasmine Pan	
	Simran Rakhra	

Winner: Puyallup debating on the Pro side. Low point win? No
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: _____ School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Newport LL	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Jeffery Liu	26
4	Michael Li	26.5

Spkr	Gig Harbor DW	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Alex Davidson	27.5
1	GABRIELLA WIDER	27

Winner: Gig Harbor DW School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave this round to the pro because the con couldnot effectively answer the question: why does P.C. need to continue if colombia's doing so well. A word of caution to the pro's though... be careful about trying to flip arguments ~~back~~ - Dont end up contradicting your own

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	BC LS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Leon Li	28.5
4	Brian Juyeong Son	28

Spkr	Eastlake BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Allison Bennett	26
3	Katie Pryal	27

Winner: BC LS debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave this to the pro mainly because of the point on cocaine production & because they called the con out on their outdated statistics. They also managed to turn the morality point against the con when it came to defending the relevance of the balloon effect

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

2nd

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1st

1min used

(Circle One) PRO **CON**

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	BC LW	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Lauryn Chae Yeon Lee	26
2	Christina Wang	26

Spkr	Mount Rainier FAN	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Abem Fekade-Tessema	27
1	Rahel Ambachew	24
	Vinh Nguyen	

Winner: BC LW School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Try to make use of all your time while speaking.
When reading your case try to look up occasionally.
During grand crossfire try not to get hung up
on just one thing.

This round I chose to vote for the pro. They had more
substantial impacts while the con dropped all of their contentions
almost immediately.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

2nd 20 secs used
30 secs used

1st 30 secs used
20 secs used

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	BC BS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Kevin Hyunjun Baek	22
4	Andy Weili Sun	23

Spkr	Peninsula LS	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Hannah Lerman	26
3	Kenzo Starks	30

Winner: Peninsula LS School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Work on using crossfire to ask actual questions rather than using it to grandstand and make statements. Phrasing questions as "would you agree with" doesn't lead anywhere. Your opponent is never going to say "you're right, I'm a big dummy."

The con carries this round as each of their contentions stands unfuted and they have shown decisively that their impacts outweigh.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Eastlake LC	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Raj Lakhani	
	Alexander Clarke	

Spkr	Bellevue BD	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Michelle Brumley	
	Maggie Davis	

Winner: _____ debating on the _____ Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: *Madison Thibodeau* School: *Aub Riverside*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BYE

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup CL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Alana Christensen	28
3	Olivia Lopez	28

Spkr	Newport RS	POINTS (0-30)
32	Ravneet Ranu	29
4	Casey Schoonover	29

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madis Thibodeau School: Aub Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- work on summary structure

- don't include term "impact" in constructive

+ Great Refutation!!

Overall I gave this round to con because they not only proved a Net loss in coca production, they also were able to counter Enemy training w/ 5% funding coming from US and how HR violations will only ↑ w/ no U.S. intervention