If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF NEW MISSION

Spkr	NewMis Gossop & Ramirez	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2A	Danelia Gossop	28	1
1A	Aleene Ramirez	27	2

NEG CHARLESTOWN

Spkr	Charle Wenle Liang	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
	Wenle Liang	25	3

Winner: ___NEW MISSION___   debating on the ___AFF___   Low point win? _____
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

verbal

Aff presented more evidence and better evidence specific to their plan. Neg's critique was not responsive to the affirmative, and was not fully developed.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

1A Speaker: _____	**1N Speaker:** _____
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 comment:	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 comment:
2A Speaker: _____	**2N Speaker:** _____
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 comment:	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 comment:

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	

Constructives

1AC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
1NC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
2AC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
2NC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐

Rebuttals

1NR	*(5 min.)*	☐
1AR	*(5 min.)*	☐
2NR	*(5 min.)*	☐
2AR	*(5 min.)*	☐

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time

~~8:00~~ - 4:30
3:30

Neg Prep Time

~~8:00~~ - 5 min
~~5:00~~

Please give all speaking, presentation, and debate-strategy related feedback verbally.

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.

Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.

Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF NEW MISSION

Spkr	**NewMis Gossop & Ramirez**	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
2A	Danelia Gossop	28	1
1A	Aleene Ramirez	27	2

NEG CHARLESTOWN

Spkr	**Charle Wenle Liang**	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
	Wenle Liang	25	3

Winner: ___NEW MISSION___ debating on the ___AFF___ Low point win? _____
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

verbal

Aff presented more evidence and better evidence specific to their plan. Neg's critique was not responsive to the affirmative, and was not fully developed.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

1A Speaker:	**1N Speaker:**
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:
2A Speaker:	**2N Speaker:**
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	

Constructives

1AC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
1NC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
2AC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐
2NC	*(8 min.)*	☐
CX	*(3 min.)*	☐

Rebuttals

1NR	*(5 min.)*	☐
1AR	*(5 min.)*	☐
2NR	*(5 min.)*	☐
2AR	*(5 min.)*	☐

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time

~~8:00~~ - 4:30
3:30

Neg Prep Time

~~8:00~~ - 3min
~~5:00~~

Please give all speaking, presentation, and debate-strategy related feedback verbally.

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF

Spkr	NewMis Jean Francois & De...	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
	~~Denzer Jean Francois~~		
1e2	Jakhi Dean	29	1

NEG

Spkr	BosLat Potter & Bloch-jones	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
2	Finian Potter	27	3
1	Owen Bloch-jones	28	2

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jakhi had a very clear presentation of his plan.
Owen & Fin challenged the Aff's plan by debating
it's feasibility in a capitalist society.

Jakhi really was able to convey in the cross
examination, that the Neg's points have nothing that
disproves his Aff statement.

Jakhi addressed all Neg's and countered them.
Owen & Fin didn't have a wide variety of
disputing points.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

1A Speaker: Jakhi	1N Speaker: Owen
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:

2A Speaker: Jakhi	2N Speaker: Finian
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	

Affirmative Arguments

Multiple examples pointing out disparities among communities and their school systems.

Addresses broader picture. Capitalism enables functioning society. This plan and the alternative are compatible. Federal Protection needed for schools since they are already trying to be providing same opportunity to everyone.

"I asked for evidence that my solution doesn't work but you had none and just said it's bad"

Negative Arguments

Addressed big picture of school system shortcomings. A capitalist system won't be conducive for empowering a central government.

Gives history of white supremacy. Socidism is successful. Examples of systemic racism in policy.

[They] role as the judge is to challenge and help educate, so I should challenge the Aff. This NEG is providing discourse.

Capitalism is going to keep the cycle of people trying to enrich themselves so plan will fail. we should try socialism.

Constructives

1AC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
1NC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
2AC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
2NC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐

Rebuttals

1NR	(5 min.)	☐
1AR	(5 min.)	☐
2NR	(5 min.)	☐
2AR	(5 min.)	☐

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time
8:00

Neg Prep Time
8:00

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF

Spkr	Brooke Adelu & Lawal	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Kehinde Adelu	28.5	3
2	David Lawal	28	4

NEG

Spkr	BosLat Abdulkadir & Jackson	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Kureysha Abdulkadir	29	1
2	Saraiya Jackson	28.5	2

Winner: __Boston Latin__ debating on the __neg__ Low point win? __no__
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Because the DA is essentially dropped, I have to evaluate their impact w/ 100% certainty. I think the aff impact is stronger and better explained — With just a little bit more work on the DA flow or ~~always~~ extending the "racism is a priori issue" card, Aff would have won. Both sides were strong. I need more clash from both earlier than the rebuttals. Focus on keeping detailed flow.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

1A Speaker: Kehinde	**1N Speaker:** Kureysha
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:
2A Speaker: David	**2N Speaker:** Saraiva
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:	comment:

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	
Put more federal $ into charter schools w/ stipulations based on de-segregation	→ charter schools take $ from public schools
de-seg key → racism is a priori issue	charter schools ⊗ answer civil rights issues
charter schools better equipped to handle individual student needs	charter schools ineffective ⊗ prepare students for college
first, say other laws should have triggered impacts ↳ later dropped	Federalism DA → plan is unconstitutional ↳ others look to our constitution ↳① civil war → ❷ Regional war in Iraq?

Constructives

1AC	(8 min.)	☑
CX	(3 min.)	☑
1NC	(8 min.)	☑
CX	(3 min.)	☑
2AC	(8 min.)	☑
CX	(3 min.)	☑
2NC	(8 min.)	☑
CX	(3 min.)	☑

Rebuttals

1NR	(5 min.)	☑
1AR	(5 min.)	☑
2NR	(5 min.)	☑
2AR	(5 min.)	☐

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time
8:00
6:26
2:56

Neg Prep Time
8:00
7:08
6:37
3:31

Please give all speaking, presentation, and debate-strategy related feedback verbally.

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF

Spkr	Brooke Feliz & Zaiter	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
	Kelvin Feliz	28.	3
	Kate Zaiter	28.5	1

NEG

Spkr	Bright Lybille Rocher	POINTS (24-30)	RANK
	Lybille Rocher	28.5	2

Winner: _Aff- Brooke Feliz & Zaiter_ debating on the _Bright Lybille Roche_ Low point win? _? if ya avg. thenyes._
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, there are 3 pts of important clash:
1. what's the ROB? (all f all ot) 2. Should we be debating policy?
3. is method or policy key?

I vote aff because their ROB went uncontested, the neg's framework arg wasn't extended properly &
(the 2NR walkeelback the arg), and the explanation of the neg's card that policy focus is key wasn't extended well in the 2NR. (no explanation of the key pts there)

Before all of that is the issue of fairness
~~there was also~~ the neg braghtthisup
in the 2NC - I think the aff was
clear enough for there to be compelling arguments
in the round and that there was sufficient
bv. in the debate. So I'm not voting on fairness,

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

<table>
<tr><td>

1A Speaker:

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:

</td><td>

1N Speaker:

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

2A Speaker:

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:

</td><td>

2N Speaker:

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:

</td></tr>
</table>

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	

Constructives

1AC	*(8 min.)*	☒
CX	*(3 min.)*	☒
1NC	*(8 min.)*	☒
CX	*(3 min.)*	☒
2AC	*(8 min.)*	☒
CX	*(3 min.)*	☒
2NC	*(8 min.)*	☒
CX	*(3 min.)*	☒

Rebuttals

1NR	*(5 min.)*	☒
1AR	*(5 min.)*	☒
2NR	*(5 min.)*	☒
2AR	*(5 min.)*	☒

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time
8:00

7.5
6.5
5.5

Neg Prep Time
8:00

7.5
5.5
3
0

Please give all speaking, presentation, and debate-strategy related feedback verbally.

↑prool
↑potential

Framework
should
affirm
reg.

WtMEET
GTOPIC-
education

Scrutinize
education.
edn=
success.

major problem.

innisible
consequences
→vulnerable
other.
eduabanden

USFG should thinkin
=policy - criticality.
USFG

They
need
TOPICAL
plan
That
USFG

We are
K aff
We talk
about curriculum
But we K
is desirable   USFG

method
should
be topical
never spect
USFG
They have
roles

nowhere
new
method?

not
doing it
for that
extend
need

impacts -
bad 4
students
denied othe
(zero tolor)

vio-
aff &
↑ because we don't
they don't heed
defend this FG vs the
action.

policy focus
key to edu
— u1

Not the
school to
push
pipeline.

They're
all jargon
we don't
but we
remove
education. their
change
evis
from learning
study.

so
broad doing
als.

spectator
approach.
need
real possibilities.

Suspension
between
valuable life
& life that
can be sacrificed.

Cynicism
bad.
Move past
high theory

The point

No solvency.

biopolitical
value
turns to
murder.
→ ext.

togetriol of
education.

NOT true →not
—why should
remove
learning.

using
jargon
to persuade

we need
change.

opp. to
logic that
demand
productivity

productive
students
be put later
from unproductive
ones

no end
result
agamben

? ??
o Politicizing
schools

NO

affirm
on presumption
↑
doesn't

reject
logic.
of productiv. D.
*abandonment

we should
think
studying
is important

noun
for whoduct
reject this goal.
reject
productivity.

studies
defer & delay
& changing
sovereignty
logic @ its
core.

changing
what
studying
looks like

we don't
studert
have
paper.

studying
not really
different
from
learning/
productivity

we have
method.

fulfill
the
ROB

NO HOW

VOTE
neg

NO
clash

★ ROB
metric. who
need
edu sses better

NO implementation
method
neg doesn't
need to fix
improve

NO AFF
benefits of this.

key
to ROB
neg @ making
edu better

NO
clash
no
write

INC   2 AR   2NR   INR   1AR   2NR   2 AR   [T]

education — Aff
only → criticizes
curriculum   the whole
           curriculum
vio - aff   WE MEET
regulates
the school
system   → Aff criticizes
beyond the   Curriculum
curriculum.   WE MEE

NOT social
services.

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF

Spkr	BosLat Iqbal & Thompson	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Hasna Iqbal	27	3
2	Nia Thompson	28.5	1

NEG

Spkr	TechBo Malik Irish	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
—	Malik Irish	28	2

Winner: _Bos Latin_ debating on the _AFF_ Low point win? _____
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _Dan D. Gillta_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I find that the Affirmative was the more persuasive argument. The NEG brought up valid counter-points but overall I find the AFF the winner.

I would note that this was extremely close and the three participants did a very good job. They were enthusiastic and well prepared.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.**

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

Constructives		
1AC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
1NC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
2AC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐
2NC	(8 min.)	☐
CX	(3 min.)	☐

1A Speaker: Hasna Iqbal

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 (27) 28 29 30
comment: good presentation
good cross ex

1N Speaker: Malik Irish

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 (28) 29 30
comment: good presentation
very well organized

2A Speaker: Nia Thompson

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 (28) 29 30
comment: strong presentation
Put ideas in own words
Well organized

2N Speaker: _____

Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment:

Rebuttals		
1NR	(5 min.)	☐
1AR	(5 min.)	☐
2NR	(5 min.)	☐
2AR	(5 min.)	☐

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	Negative Arguments
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	

Affirmative Arguments

Assure equal access to Special Education

Every Student given a good education

clarify IDEA

education key to closing achievement gap

will help economy

unequal education = violation of human rts

Negative Arguments

Education equality doesn't equal economic equality

outside issues impact achievement gap

problem is not schools its racism

Educational equality will not solve societal problems

give people the information on who they can contact for help

Each team has 8 minutes of total prep time.

Aff Prep Time
8:00

Neg Prep Time
8:00

Please give all speaking, presentation, and debate-strategy related feedback verbally.

If you have any other questions about your round, please text a query to 617.863.BDL1 (617.863.2351). We will respond as quickly as possible.
Half points are permitted, but quarters and tenths are not. Please rank students in order, 1 being best, 4 being worst. Ranks must agree with points. You may tie points but not ranks.
Please return ballot within 15 minutes after round ends.

AFF			
Spkr	Brooke Dechraoui & Garcia	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Nassim Dechraoui	26.5	1
2	Lillian Garcia	26	2

NEG			
Spkr	BosLat Satchebell & Nibert	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2	Darius Satchebell	25	4
1	Finn Nibert	26	3

Winner: Brooke D & G _____ debating on the ___ Aff ___ Low point win? _____
School/Team   Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The decision for the round would normally rest on topicality & framework first as a priori issues, but I'm given no standards or reasons to give the 3 topicality & frameworks such voting priority in this round. Without impacts to the violation (the definition & violation being well debated), I'm otherwise left to vote on the one decision point provided in the 1AR. The voting decision point is: Status quo or post-Aff. With the aff's case largely uncontested, save for the one point on root cause that needed to be applied somewhere on case, the decision rolls to the Aff. On weight of evidence & argumentation, I vote Aff.

High School - Varsity

Speaker Points are an indication of the quality of the speaking of each individual debater. **The decision** in a round is not made on the quality of speaking, but rather on the quality of arguments.

Areas of Focus for Speaker Points:

Cross-Ex: Strong debaters use CX to clarify, entrap, and illustrate deficiencies; reference CX in later speeches.
Organization: Following a clear roadmap; signposting effectively; managing time and evidence effectively.
Conviction: How debaters convey their belief in their arguments through changes in language and tone.

1A Speaker: Nassim	**1N Speaker:** Fih
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 (26) 27 28 29 30
comment: I would recommend diversifying your evidence in the 1AC w/ the 2 extra minutes you had left over. Standing on CX.	comment: Flesh out your positions on T/framework reorganization (Good job using all 8 min of 1NC, given you were against your first AFF
2A Speaker: Lillian	**2N Speaker:** Darius
Speaker Points: 24 25 (26) 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 (25) 26 27 28 29 30
comment: Flesh out your T/framework organization, there were good arguments that could have been bulleted, direct responses to T/framework	comment: Hey, thank you for showing up at 7:30 on a Saturday to debate Varsity. Practice impromptu, back-and-forth arguments. Don't give up!

Areas of Focus for Deciding Win/Loss:

Use the area below to record strong affirmative and negative arguments that you will use to write your Reason for Decision (RFD)

Affirmative Arguments	**Negative Arguments**
In this section, focus on the clash between Aff and Neg while weighing impacts presented.	
Measure your stance against the position of your opponent	