LEAVING

Room: 116
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2

Wang, Michael

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

NEG

Spkr	O'Brya Gary & Gregorio Go...	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Duwayne Gary	27	4
2	Rosa Gregorio Gomez	29	2

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF presented plan w/ impacts that outweighed. Neg did not present clear alternative. AFF presented better evidence — climate change threatens humanity and we have ethical/moral obligation to act.

NEG did not present clear counterplan, and did not address the impacts of climate change.

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~~ -:20

~~7:40 = 2~~

5:40

Neg Prep Time

~~8:00~~ -1

~~7:00~~ -1:40

5:20 min

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

Room: 124
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2 Le, Dat

Excel

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	Bright Lybille Rocher	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Lybille Rocher	29	1

NEG

Spkr	BosLat Iqbal & Thompson	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2	Hasna Iqbal	29	2
1	Nia Thompson	28.	3

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

Signature: Dat

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Advice for both team: Provide some more evidences, specific.

- The ~~problem~~ issue come down to: Should the Fed or states ~~be~~ be in ~~the~~ control of $ distribution.

~~Both~~
The affirmative ~~team~~ is not "super" specific on how the plan will be implement, ~~be~~ neither is the Neg. However, the Aff team to be better in performance and responding to Neg critics.

Aff win on discredit ~~the~~ ability of the state in implementing the plan. Neg should be more persuasive to discredit the 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: _____	**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.	
Inherency: Unequal funding distribution lead to inequality.	→ To fully agree.
Plan: US Fed should be in charge of funding distribution	→ Counter plan: State should control.
→ Perm: Do both.	→ Can't do both. How will they cooperate?
They could, but not should.	
Arguments:	Arguments:
- State will not distribute $ to low income minority should where it is needed the most.	- Fed are too big. State is better to solve for specific case.
- It is not. Previous policy show some evidence, state also racist, the problem is how to solve it.	- Fed is racist,
- ~~State~~ Plan for the state is also vague, no number showing success story.	- The plan is vague, How to implement, and WHO

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
- 1:00
7:00
6:30
6:00 - 3:00

Neg Prep Time

8:00
- 1:00
7:00 - 3:30
3:30

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

Room: 118
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2

Pasiewicz, Marya-

Boston Latin

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	TechBo Malik Irish	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
	Malik Irish	28	1

NEG

Spkr	Brooke Adelu & Lawal	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
	Kehinde Adelu	27	3
	David Lawal	27	2

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

Signature: Maryanne Pasiewicz

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff is the only team that extends impact. The neg concedes aff's framing that RDJ is to vote for team that best challenges disenfranchisement. The aff wins that their education is best to challenge st. racism. Neg doesn't really have impact on DA and doesn't weigh it against aff.

~~DA should be ext~~

Need better linker on DA - more specific to aff.

If aff ~~to~~ defend implem. of plan you should read FW ~~or theory~~ they or topicality.

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.	
Status -Read cards - Make pun ⇒ Ev for why our FW is bcof -Do more impact calc	- make ev or status cp specific to aff. They are in context of STEM, career education ≠ [redacted] disenfranchisement - Extend impacts

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~~

7:00

Neg Prep Time

8:00

~~[redacted]~~

~~1:35~~

~~4:00~~

2:00

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

(P)

Room: 125
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2

Newman, Jennifer

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 Satchebell & Nibert	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Darius Satchebell	26.5	3
2	Finn Nibert	27	2

NEG

Spkr	NewMis Jean Francois & De...	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
	~~Denzer Jean Francois~~	~~28.5~~	
1/2	Jakhi Dean	28.5	1

Winner: NewMiS (School/Team) debating on the Neg (Side (Aff or Neg)) Low point win? NO

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote on T substantial & the Timetrame / solvency arg on the CP

The aff didn't provide a contesting definition of substantial, ~~and the~~ and spent too little time on it in the 2AC. They also didn't contest that PPP will solve faster & their ev that public solves better didn't hold up to the ev that PPP will solve.

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: Satchebell	**1N Speaker:** Dean
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 (26.5)	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 (28.5)
comment: great 1AC needs more organization in rebuttal	*comment:* good clash - most organized but needs to work on signposting & line by line
2A Speaker: ~~[illegible]~~ Nibert	**2N Speaker:** X
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 (27)	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment: Needs to work on line by line, good cross ex	*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.	
← Question for all - what is the ROB ??? → where are your flows? "if all of" ↓ You both should be flowing. (aff)	
Aff needs ~~clear~~ clear & complete response to T substantial → this won't be the last time this comes up.	2NC/1NR Arg split 1NR just repeat of 2NC - To be fair this debater is going maverick
aff need resp to privitization good (i.e. private bad @ clim change ed	"NET BENEFIT"

ROB is to save earth through education:

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~~
~~7:45~~
~~7:30~~
5:00

Neg Prep Time

~~8:00~~
~~7:5~~
~~9:00~~
~~6:30~~
2:00

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

Room: 115
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2 Shome, Jay

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 Abdulkadir & Jackson	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Kureysha Abdulkadir	26	4
2	Saraiya Jackson	26	3

NEG

Spkr	NewMis Gossop & Ramirez	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1	Danelia Gossop	27	1
2	Aleene Ramirez	26	2

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Daniela & Aleene really had a tough debate since Kureysha & Saraiya chose the open debate form. However, the Neg found several flaws in the Aff's plan that the Aff could not rebut.

~~Neg~~ Aff. plowed through a lot of data explaining the problems in sexual education.
Neg demanded details on what the solution is.
Aff said funding is the solution.
Neg wins because they showed examples of previous failed fundings and that advocacy and awareness would be a better solution.

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: Kureysha	**1N Speaker:** Daniela
Speaker Points: 24 ~~25~~ (26) 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 (27) 28 29 30
comment:	*comment:*
2A Speaker: Sarciya	**2N Speaker:** Aleene
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.	
Sexual education is inadequate. Abstience, pregnancy, STIs are confusion-riddled areas. Increase funding of sex ed in K-12	Only criticism, no concrete solutions. What are the solutions? They won't magically go away. Anti-politics are suggested. Foster discourse. Funding isn't going be the path.
Funded programs are good. Programs are bad because funding is insufficient.	There are already programs that do exactly what they are proposing to do with the funding.
Education also provides awareness.	What we need is awareness, not education. → Mobilization
We will be impacting millions.	Where would the money come from. Something else would financially suffer.

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

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

Room: 123
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2 Dooley, Ben

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 Forges & Mohamed	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
	Falianne Forges	28.5	1
	~~Adna Mohamed~~		

NEG

Spkr	Brooke Feliz & Zaiter	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2N	Kelvin Feliz	~~28~~ 27.5	2
1N	Kate Zaiter	28	3

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

Signature: Ben Dooley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff K had some clear topicality violations (USFG agent, funding), but neg argued the K, attempting to provide themselves as an alt.

ROB's framwork as defined by Aff was one instance of the K working, which was accomplished in this round.

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

~~4:22~~

~~2:22~~

~~1:22~~

Neg Prep Time

8:00

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

Room: 117
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2

Gillietti, Damian

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 Houston & Vaz	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2	Jacqueline Houston	29	1
1	Julie Vaz	28.5	2

NEG

Spkr	Brooke Dechraoui & Garcia	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
2	Nassim Dechraoui	28	3
1	Lillian Garcia	28	4

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

Signature: Dan W Gillietti

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I find that the Affirmative made the more persuasive argument.

The negative did have as organized an argument. It seemed like they ~~were a little~~ lost focus on their argument.

Overall, the teams put on a very strong and entertaining debate.

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: Julie Vaz	**1N Speaker:** Lillian Garcia
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 (28) 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 (28) 29 30
comment: Very Focused, organized good speaking style	comment: put arguments in own words, lost some focus during cross-exam
2A Speaker: Jacqueline Houston	**2N Speaker:** Nassim Dechraoui
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 (29) 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 (28) 29 30
comment: Very organized argument Showed mastery of material	comment: good presentation cited sources well

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.	
US should increase investment in STEM Education critical to economy cybersecurity issues competitiveness	increased funding won't help the lack of interest in STEM careers should focus on equal education issues of racism, inequality

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

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

Room: 126
Start: 10:15 AM
Varsity

2

Rappaport, Joe

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	Charle Wenle Liang	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1&2	Wenle Liang	26	2

NEG

Spkr	BosLat Shayne Clinton	POINTS (24 - 30)	RANK
1&2	Shayne Clinton	28.5	1

Winner: BosLat Shayne Clinton (School/Team) debating on the Neg (Side (Aff or Neg)) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joe Rappaport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The one-bullet critique of spreading was a non-factor in that a reason to prefer it first, or w/ greater impact than the other positions regarding the Aff-provided, Neg-accepted weighing mechanism of in-round education.

The Neg dismantled the Aff performative advocacy using the weighing mechanism itself. To summarize: The Aff kicks all questions, no answers. The Aff fails to weigh the education gained from her story against the Negative's evidence. The Neg holds up their evidence as proof of educational attainment, under the Aff-admitted lens that policy education is important (he argues it's the most important). Without an argument how story-telling is more powerful, effective or otherwise "real" than academic/policy-based education, I vote Neg.

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: Venle	**1N Speaker:** Shayna
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment: Conviction was great, but organization was lacking. I would organize the parts of your kinks bullets & subtitles	*comment:* Excellent work bringing key CX admissions in every speech.
2A Speaker:	**2N Speaker:**
Speaker Points: 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	**Speaker Points:** 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
comment: Calling arguments "weird" or "bad" is insufficient	*comment:* Both slowdown in CX.

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.	
Additionally, don't give arguments as questions. Especially in debate.	don't point. switch your volume in a nicely donned brick room.

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~~
6

Neg Prep Time

~~8:00~~
~~7:00~~
6:05

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

no new evidence????

CP is scol lunchers aff

① food is important

☐ esp for poor kids

Food → academic achievement

△ CX academic inclusion in debate space

△ CX chinese immigrant used as evidence

☐ food is bigus

△ Food fixes problem across color lines

→ (non-responsive) → racism caused by racial inequity. eg. in food

food → equality → ~~no~~ attack surface

☐ food helps low income families the most

△ cross color lines

☐ school food access solves for cycle of poverty

☐ inequal access to food = inequal outcomes

Plan → fund food

☐ fed policy key △ food = debate

calling CP "weird" and "bad" is ~~of~~ devoid of analytics

(me) "I don't understand" is a bad response w/o analysis

solv using my speech vs $ → food also solves for poor chinese imms.

$ → nutrients → potential self-actualized success

☐ adv / debate ☐ lifetime health outcomes

Spreading K

Spreading excludes

English-limited students

Judge understands

immigrant minorities
non-black minorities

"white people" don't understand that there aren't "asian people"

Black ≠ Hispanic ≠ Asian

"only black lives matter" LOL

needs performance aff efficacy cards

case question

Raj 12

☐ debate must be honest chat → Policy affs teach us about real world

① ② ③ edn a story ④ unfair

☐ nominative knowledge(?) rejects alternative knowledge

↳ (alt facts?)

Edu means of

AFF K	CP
I know about Asian immigrants	few understanding of cards and case evidence - NEW discussion now
All a. No A. story can be good	root cause analysis vs branch

solvency vs solvency

"usfg can't solve racism... look at history" LOL

USFG can't solve problem (Brown v BOE?)

- (no plan) → no plan → no academic
- efficacy is judge → ∅ rote presumpt
  opponent acknowledge there is a problem
- academic → policy is important → ↦ I used evidence, Δ education
- Fairness is important

plan pre req to solv