

Tournament Date: 11/7 - 11/8		Tournament Location: Ripon HS			
Round/Flight: 1A	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: Scott Wunn	Judge School: Ripon HS	
Affirmative: Churchill KK			Name or Code →	Negative: Apple Valley PW	
Aff. Points: 29	← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) →				Neg. Points: 28.5
Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative		Winning Team/Code: Churchill KK			Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

· The affirmative case was well structured. While the links to the criterion are mostly present within the case, there are some specific arguments without direct links to the criterion. An example of this was the Smith evidence in your second contention.

- The 1st rebuttal had an issue with covering the bottom portion of the Aff case.*
- Solid extensions!*
- The 2nd rebuttal covered the key issues. While rushed at times, it was well structured.*

· The negative case offense was solid, but the preemptive arguments to the affirmative were not necessary, especially since most of them didn't apply to the aff your opponent read.

- The coverage of the aff case was easy to follow, but was defensive oriented.*
- The second rebuttal was scattered and lacked a clear summary and comparison of key arguments.*

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

At the end of the round the affirmative upheld that we should look to the value of Justice and the criterion of Protection of Rights. The analysis about the relationship between the government and the individuals was not addressed sufficiently by the negative, so that carried the affirmative value and criterion through the round.

Since I'm looking to that framework, the affirmative is winning. First, the affirmative pointed out the negative did not attack the sub point b of the first contention or the Evans evidence at the bottom of the case. The affirmative extended those and showed how they best protect rights with that offense. Second, the negative offered no offense linking back to protection of rights. So I affirm.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Affirmative Constructive.....	6 min.
Neg. Cross-Ex of Aff.....	3 min.
Negative Constructive.....	7 min.
Aff. Cross-Ex of Neg.....	3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal.....	4 min.
Negative Rebuttal.....	6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal.....	3 min.

Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.

SAMPLE