Judge: Kaeli Meno
Ballot Code: 15

Round: 1

UWB BadgleyBadgley versus DU Alayna-Trier-Alex-Spencer

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Prop had technical difficulties and dropped. I appreciate how everyone rolled with the technical punches though and was very adaptable this round.

First Aff: Alayna Trier

N / A

Second Aff: Alex Spencer

N / A

First Neg: Badgley

N / A

Second Neg: Badgley

N / A

Judge: Robert Hockema
Ballot Code: 16

Round: 1

UWB Omar-Fageeri-Omar-Fageeri versus BSU Elizabeth-Bogle-Elizabeth-Bogle

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This debate is about burdens. The value debate AND the util debate come down to whether aff is sufficiently justifying addressing structural violence, which neg eventually eats by trying to claim the bill doesn't help marginalized communities.
ON the value debate: you're both right. Neg, you should argue that "should" is about cost benefit analysis, and OUGHT is about moral obligation. I don't think this value debate needed to happen. Aff, you're right that structural violence is within the scope of the debate. You're claiming that the scope with which we should enact policy is through addressing structural violence. That's not abusive, but it sets the burden low for you unless you create a metric for you to win. Minimizing structural violence is what I get, but what does that mean?
ON the practical debate, I think Aff definitely proves that this money would go a *long* way -- at best, it gets people out of debt and revitalizes demand in local communities. However, I have a hard time reconciling this with Negs harms and the responses to them in the debate. Neg's material on tax credits, bailouts, and unemployment need impacting, but so do Aff's solvency claims.
That said: without knowing what the bar for addressing structural violence is, and with an inadequate response to the harms of the bill (unweighed next to the pros), my ballot goes to the negative.

First Aff: Omar Fageeri

Excellent structure and detail in your case. As a note, I would recommend detailing impacts and solvency. It's hard for me to buy your 2AC when it's based on Neg not impacting magnitude and doing link work when your case proves that structural violence matters/exists, but does little to prove that the bill would remedy the issue (other than talking briefly about purchasing power). Your burden is too low: proving that you help people to *a* degree, and that it disproportionately helps marginalized communities, is half the battle.

Second Aff: --

Excellent structure and detail in your case. As a note, I would recommend detailing impacts and solvency. It's hard for me to buy your 2AC when it's based on Neg not impacting magnitude and doing link work when your case proves that structural violence matters/exists, but does little to prove that the bill would remedy the issue (other than talking briefly about purchasing power). Your burden is too low: proving that you help people to *a* degree, and that it disproportionately helps marginalized communities, is half the battle.

First Neg: BSU Elizabeth-Bogle-Elizabeth-Bogle

Excellent structure and detail in your case. As a note, I would recommend detailing impacts and solvency. It's hard for me to buy your 2AC when it's based on Neg not impacting

magnitude and doing link work when your case proves that structural violence matters/exists, but does little to prove that the bill would remedy the issue (other than talking briefly about purchasing power). Your burden is too low: proving that you help people to *a* degree, and that it disproportionately helps marginalized communities, is half the battle.

Second Neg: --

Excellent structure and detail in your case. As a note, I would recommend detailing impacts and solvency. It's hard for me to buy your 2AC when it's based on Neg not impacting magnitude and doing link work when your case proves that structural violence matters/exists, but does little to prove that the bill would remedy the issue (other than talking briefly about purchasing power). Your burden is too low: proving that you help people to *a* degree, and that it disproportionately helps marginalized communities, is half the battle.

Judge: Parker Davidson
Ballot Code: 23

Round: 1

BSU Mariah-BowmanMariah-Bowman versus NDSU Jack-LawThomas-Ohmann

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Affirmative severely misdefined the motion, I think negative did a good job having material debating with both the intended motion and the motion given. Aff also failed to prove any solvency with their case, and neg did a good job refuting the lack of solvency but also proving that aff could actually be worsening their own advocacy.
Aff also failed to mechanize the "stopping" aspect of the motion.

First Aff: Mariah

Compliment: I think your advocacy in terms of morality and equity is very solid, and your points played well to it. Your material was very well connected to each other, and I think keeping that thematic consistency is important.
Improvement: Watch your definitions and make sure they're the right ones intended by the motion. Intervarsity was definitely intended to be about intercollegiate competition. And yes, you don't hav to abide by the negative's model, but I'd at least account for it.

Second Aff: NO 2ND

Compliment: I think your advocacy in terms of morality and equity is very solid, and your points played well to it. Your material was very well connected to each other, and I think keeping that thematic consistency is important.
Improvement: Watch your definitions and make sure they're the right ones intended by the motion. Intervarsity was definitely intended to be about intercollegiate competition. And yes, you don't hav to abide by the negative's model, but I'd at least account for it.

First Neg: Jack

Compliment: I think your advocacy in terms of morality and equity is very solid, and your points played well to it. Your material was very well connected to each other, and I think keeping that thematic consistency is important.
Improvement: Watch your definitions and make sure they're the right ones intended by the motion. Intervarsity was definitely intended to be about intercollegiate competition. And yes, you don't hav to abide by the negative's model, but I'd at least account for it.

Second Neg: Thomas

Compliment: I think your advocacy in terms of morality and equity is very solid, and your points played well to it. Your material was very well connected to each other, and I think keeping that thematic consistency is important.
Improvement: Watch your definitions and make sure they're the right ones intended by the motion. Intervarsity was definitely intended to be about intercollegiate competition. And yes, you don't hav to abide by the negative's model, but I'd at least account for it.

Judge: Andy Christensen
Ballot Code: 11

Round: 1

UA Athenia Large Dakota Seibert versus BSU Gina Esposito

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I sided with the aff that -- in this case -- the meaningful evaluation of the round comes down to holding the power to execute the agenda of party in control. Neg didn't have to prove the Dems were/are successful, but tried to.
As in oral rfd, I thing that framing this round as a value with either net bene or On-bal would have been ideal. Framing as fact round under a preponderance of evidence (when much of the evidence submitted was circumstantial) wasn't the structure for a monster case.

First Aff: Athenia Large

You lay out a really interesting case, highly logical, unique and interesting, and generous enough to last throughout the case. One improvement would be tighter signposting and word economy. Add to that, please slow down a little in framework -- that's where the decision making details come from, and I need those!

Second Aff: Dakota Seibert

You lay out a really interesting case, highly logical, unique and interesting, and generous enough to last throughout the case. One improvement would be tighter signposting and word economy. Add to that, please slow down a little in framework -- that's where the decision making details come from, and I need those!

First Neg: Gina Esposito

You lay out a really interesting case, highly logical, unique and interesting, and generous enough to last throughout the case. One improvement would be tighter signposting and word economy. Add to that, please slow down a little in framework -- that's where the decision making details come from, and I need those!

Second Neg: Gina Esposito

You lay out a really interesting case, highly logical, unique and interesting, and generous enough to last throughout the case. One improvement would be tighter signposting and word economy. Add to that, please slow down a little in framework -- that's where the decision making details come from, and I need those!

Judge: Nick Sitzman
Ballot Code: 17

Round: 1

HP Lucy-ManningRishona-Raub versus Negative ISU Joseph-TylerJoseph-Tyler5

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This round was a little confusing to judge because of the definitions and interpretations of the round. The round was defined by the affirmative team as a fact round, but they asked me to weight the round through net benefits and then presented a case in which they called for a change to the status quo.
The affirmative definition of holiday celebration was a little unclear and many of their examples didn't even interact with it. The operating part of the definition was, "spend significant time and money and disrupt the normal structure of the day to celebrate." However, the biggest example the affirmative team used as a bad holiday was Columbus Day. They analyzed the possible harms of celebrating this one holiday really well, but I wasn't clear what schools dedicate that much time and money to Columbus Day in the status quo.
Meanwhile, the Negative team made great points about the importance of celebrating King Day, Arbor Day, etc. and even made a great case for celebrating cultural holidays outside one's own culture. This ultimately won me over, because while I agree we shouldn't celebrate Columbus Day in schools, the mere possibility that some schools somewhere celebrating it wasn't so much of a risk that I was willing to axe every single other holiday to get rid of it as well.
I also sided with the negative when it came to allergy risk and ability for parents to opt out. To my understanding, these options are commonplace already, and the negative demonstrated that for me.

First Aff: Lucy Manning

Great organization and clear argumentation! You also spoke phenomenally and I was able to flow your speech with no problem.
Work on basing your arguments off of your interpretation of the resolution and your definitions. I wrote this in my RFD as well, but your definitions were rather vague in this round and the examples you used in your arguments did not really clarify these and in some cases felt like they contradicted them.

Second Aff: Rishona Raub

Great organization and clear argumentation! You also spoke phenomenally and I was able to flow your speech with no problem.
Work on basing your arguments off of your interpretation of the resolution and your definitions. I wrote this in my RFD as well, but your definitions were rather vague in this round and the examples you used in your arguments did not really clarify these and in some cases felt like they contradicted them.

First Neg: Joseph Tyler

Great organization and clear argumentation! You also spoke phenomenally and I was able to flow your speech with no problem.

Work on basing your arguments off of your interpretation of the resolution and your definitions. I wrote this in my RFD as well, but your definitions were rather vague in this round and the examples you used in your arguments did not really clarify these and in some cases felt like they contradicted them.

Second Neg: Just one perosn on neg team.

Great organization and clear argumentation! You also spoke phenomenally and I was able to flow your speech with no problem.
Work on basing your arguments off of your interpretation of the resolution and your definitions. I wrote this in my RFD as well, but your definitions were rather vague in this round and the examples you used in your arguments did not really clarify these and in some cases felt like they contradicted them.

Judge: Greg Foster
Ballot Code: 14

Round: 1

ISU Colter-BarkerJett-Smith versus UA Geneva-LuteriaPaul-Cosby

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I vote for the affirmative based on superior framing of the round and analysis throughout. I side with the affirmative definition of failure that centers around expected results due to analysis that the affirmative has the right to define terms and that the definition incorporates an evaluation of results anyway. The affirmative provides great analysis that wins in the election do not translate to results because of obstruction by McConnell and SCOTUS. Further, the aff provided great evidence about how Democrats were expected to win much more, with subsequent harms of winning less going conceded by the neg. Ultimately, the best neg argument was energizing voters to vote in the Georgia runoff election from calling the election a success, but as the aff pointed out this is a benefit derived from the policy outcomes of calling the election a success. In the end, I prefer the aff definition of failure that incorporates expectations and am left to side with C1-3 due to few refutations by the neg.

First Aff: Colter Barker

I thought you had great knowledge about the topic and provided great examples of races, from specific information on the Georgia runoff to the point that Susan Collins won despite Joe Biden winning her state. The biggest thing I would suggest for you is more time on extension, because your opponents dropped many of your points and the round would have been easier to win having said they dropped X, Y and Z.

Second Aff: Jethro Smith

I thought you had great knowledge about the topic and provided great examples of races, from specific information on the Georgia runoff to the point that Susan Collins won despite Joe Biden winning her state. The biggest thing I would suggest for you is more time on extension, because your opponents dropped many of your points and the round would have been easier to win having said they dropped X, Y and Z.

First Neg: Geneva Luteria

I thought you had great knowledge about the topic and provided great examples of races, from specific information on the Georgia runoff to the point that Susan Collins won despite Joe Biden winning her state. The biggest thing I would suggest for you is more time on extension, because your opponents dropped many of your points and the round would have been easier to win having said they dropped X, Y and Z.

Second Neg: Paul Cosby

I thought you had great knowledge about the topic and provided great examples of races, from specific information on the Georgia runoff to the point that Susan Collins won despite Joe Biden winning her state. The biggest thing I would suggest for you is more time on

extension, because your opponents dropped many of your points and the round would have been easier to win having said they dropped X, Y and Z.

Judge: Isaac Goff-Mitchell
Ballot Code: 10

Round: 1

Casi-LeBlancCora-Lyon versus Devin-SchurmanParker-Brown

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative wins on the resolutional analysis, and convinced me that this debate should be judged on the expectations of the Democratic party vs the results of 2020. Additionally, the state legislature argument stands strong by the end of the debate. The neg has strong arguments on the strength of the presidency, and the symbolism, but the affirmative argumentation is strong enough to prevail.

First Aff: Casi-LeBlanc

Very good structure, but needs to work on answering cross-x questions

Second Aff: Cora-Lyon

Very good structure, but needs to work on answering cross-x questions

First Neg: Devin Schurman

Very good structure, but needs to work on answering cross-x questions

Second Neg: Parker Brown

Very good structure, but needs to work on answering cross-x questions

Judge: Corey Patton
Ballot Code: 12

Round: 1

BSU Alex-Hupe versus UA Henry-Mildon

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I was convinced that the preferable education is one that incorporates some degree of religious celebration, especially to the extent such celebration can be diversified. And religious celebration can be incorporated into the curriculum with minimal or no detriment to the school's other educational pillars / objectives.
The Aff's strongest point that celebration could create a propensity for social stigmatism or isolation, and bullying / discrimination. But those concepts were underdeveloped and received significant enough refutation from the Neg for me to be convinced that, even if they do occur, they are outweighed by the benefits described by Neg.

First Aff: Alex Hupe

Great job identifying and running a wide breadth of arguments that ranged from governmental policy considerations to more humanistic concerns. You showed a good grasp of the different layers that were pertinent to this debate. Going forward, make sure that you are fully exploring the value of governmental polices, rather than relying on a policy having an inherit value (ex: if we value a constitutional separation of church and state, why do we value it beyond the mere fact that it is constitutionally enshrined?)

Second Aff: Alex Hupe

Great job identifying and running a wide breadth of arguments that ranged from governmental policy considerations to more humanistic concerns. You showed a good grasp of the different layers that were pertinent to this debate. Going forward, make sure that you are fully exploring the value of governmental polices, rather than relying on a policy having an inherit value (ex: if we value a constitutional separation of church and state, why do we value it beyond the mere fact that it is constitutionally enshrined?)

First Neg: Henry Mildon

Great job identifying and running a wide breadth of arguments that ranged from governmental policy considerations to more humanistic concerns. You showed a good grasp of the different layers that were pertinent to this debate. Going forward, make sure that you are fully exploring the value of governmental polices, rather than relying on a policy having an inherit value (ex: if we value a constitutional separation of church and state, why do we value it beyond the mere fact that it is constitutionally enshrined?)

Second Neg: Henry Mildon

Great job identifying and running a wide breadth of arguments that ranged from governmental policy considerations to more humanistic concerns. You showed a good grasp of the different layers that were pertinent to this debate. Going forward, make sure that you are fully exploring the value of governmental polices, rather than relying on a policy having

an inherit value (ex: if we value a constitutional separation of church and state, why do we value it beyond the mere fact that it is constitutionally enshrined?)

Judge: Pete Litster
Ballot Code: 25

Round: 1

Amber Perez versus Madalyn Bond

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: This was a low point win for Aff.
Neg was more proficient on the flow, great evidence authority, generally and kept to strict rules on speaker roles, as well as impacting the imprtance of such. So neg gets higher speaker ranking/points for general clarity and proficiency.
However Aff carried the winning argument specifically with the consistent contention that holding up an entire Covid infrastructure bill over UBI (cash payments to individuals), is problematic for every reason given and maintained, and impacted through every speech. This tipped the balance to the affirmative on the topic, and I say this as personally a big fan of UBI, which I disclosed at the end. Great job everybody!

First Aff: Amber Perez

Thank you for your guidance on pre-round housekeeping :) Gave a solid 1 AC- clear contentions and signposting. Got kind of bound up on Contention 2 due to time, so maybe tighten up your contention one a bit more or speed it up. Also be careful of new arguments in 1AR. 2NR did a good job catching that.

Second Aff: Amber Perez

Thank you for your guidance on pre-round housekeeping :) Gave a solid 1 AC- clear contentions and signposting. Got kind of bound up on Contention 2 due to time, so maybe tighten up your contention one a bit more or speed it up. Also be careful of new arguments in 1AR. 2NR did a good job catching that.

First Neg: Madalyn Bond

Thank you for your guidance on pre-round housekeeping :) Gave a solid 1 AC- clear contentions and signposting. Got kind of bound up on Contention 2 due to time, so maybe tighten up your contention one a bit more or speed it up. Also be careful of new arguments in 1AR. 2NR did a good job catching that.

Second Neg: Madalyn Bond

Thank you for your guidance on pre-round housekeeping :) Gave a solid 1 AC- clear contentions and signposting. Got kind of bound up on Contention 2 due to time, so maybe tighten up your contention one a bit more or speed it up. Also be careful of new arguments in 1AR. 2NR did a good job catching that.

Judge: Parker Davidson
Ballot Code: 32

Round: 2

Affirmative ISU Joseph-TylerJoseph-Tyler versus UA Casi-LeBlanc-Cora-Lyon

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Negative did a great job with pointing out flaws in the advocacy, but on magnitude aff created a better world w regards to reducing voter suppression. Additionally, I think neg's case was reliant on the motion being introduced on a far broader and more categorical level than just specifically federal elections.

First Aff: Joseph Tyler

COMPLIMENT: Way to read the motion effectively and introduce a plan that is specific to the motion itself. I was concerned going into a motion like this that I'd see aff try to cover more ground than necessary, but you were well-focused and insistent on your case, and did a great job explaining why your case works.
IMPROVEMENT: Make sure your advocacy and your policy carry consistency. Effacing disfranchisement whilst strengthening ID laws definitely causes an issue, as neg aptly pointed out. I think the example of communities in AK was a decent example.

Second Aff: N/A

COMPLIMENT: Way to read the motion effectively and introduce a plan that is specific to the motion itself. I was concerned going into a motion like this that I'd see aff try to cover more ground than necessary, but you were well-focused and insistent on your case, and did a great job explaining why your case works.
IMPROVEMENT: Make sure your advocacy and your policy carry consistency. Effacing disfranchisement whilst strengthening ID laws definitely causes an issue, as neg aptly pointed out. I think the example of communities in AK was a decent example.

First Neg: Casi LeBlanc

COMPLIMENT: Way to read the motion effectively and introduce a plan that is specific to the motion itself. I was concerned going into a motion like this that I'd see aff try to cover more ground than necessary, but you were well-focused and insistent on your case, and did a great job explaining why your case works.
IMPROVEMENT: Make sure your advocacy and your policy carry consistency. Effacing disfranchisement whilst strengthening ID laws definitely causes an issue, as neg aptly pointed out. I think the example of communities in AK was a decent example.

Second Neg: Cora Lyon

COMPLIMENT: Way to read the motion effectively and introduce a plan that is specific to the motion itself. I was concerned going into a motion like this that I'd see aff try to cover more

ground than necessary, but you were well-focused and insistent on your case, and did a great job explaining why your case works.

IMPROVEMENT: Make sure your advocacy and your policy carry consistency. Effacing disfranchisement whilst strengthening ID laws definitely causes an issue, as neg aptly pointed out. I think the example of communities in AK was a decent example.

Judge: geoff klinger
Ballot Code: 46

Round: 2

FSU Lynom versus BSU Bowman

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: 1) The affirmative creates a tight case, almost too tight in my estimation. By limiting "art" to protest/performance art, and by defining "good" as something that creates social change, the affirmative creates a self-fulfilling case. The negative needs to more vigorously challenge those definitions. Neg arguments are decent, a bit vague and repetitive, but they need an better overall frame through counter-definitions of "good" and "art" (not to mention "political viewpoint" which affirmative did not define, as you point out in c-x, but you do nothing with that, and do not offer a counter-definition); 2) I would also like to see better direct refutation of the two main contentions of the affirmative case; and 3) Neg needs better examples, especially in first constructive speech, to illustrate your arguments. Aff cites (at least) four examples in first speech, and even more in second constructive speech.

First Aff: Lynom

Good use of examples to support your position. Strive to be more extemporaneous (esp. in first speech; later speeches were better).

Second Aff: Lynom

Good use of examples to support your position. Strive to be more extemporaneous (esp. in first speech; later speeches were better).

First Neg: Bowman

Good use of examples to support your position. Strive to be more extemporaneous (esp. in first speech; later speeches were better).

Second Neg: Bowman

Good use of examples to support your position. Strive to be more extemporaneous (esp. in first speech; later speeches were better).

Judge: Sarah Partlow Lefevre
Ballot Code: 34

Round: 2

Affirmative DU Alayna-TrierAlex-Spencer versus Negative UA Athenia-LargeDakota-Seibert

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The neg won a case turn and successfully challenged the FCC as arbiter of truth. The Neg also won a false balancing argument with provax vs. antivax as an example.

First Aff: Alex

Great job in the 1AR. You forced them to consider their relation to the status quo and regroup. I would like to see more qualified sources cited by the 1AC.

Second Aff: Alayna

Great job in the 1AR. You forced them to consider their relation to the status quo and regroup. I would like to see more qualified sources cited by the 1AC.

First Neg: Athenia

Great job in the 1AR. You forced them to consider their relation to the status quo and regroup. I would like to see more qualified sources cited by the 1AC.

Second Neg: Dakota

Great job in the 1AR. You forced them to consider their relation to the status quo and regroup. I would like to see more qualified sources cited by the 1AC.

Judge: Sam Woolsey
Ballot Code: 37

Round: 2

HP Devin Schurman Parker Brown versus BSU Alex Hupe

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I voted on partial solvency in this round. Aff provides an uncontested claim to decrease polarization, and Neg fails to outweigh with 1st amendment DA. Although I don't love the Aff's Supreme Court response to the 1st amendment DA, it does the job. I don't understand how new advancements in tech or culture would create a constitutional problem that we didn't have in the 60s.

First Aff: Parker Brown

I was really impressed by your performance in this round. You set and then implemented the policy framework very well, and your strategic choice to fight for limited solvency gave you a major edge in this round. I would like to see more impacting and weighing of your voters. As I said in feedback, you're winning on polarization, but you're mostly leaving it up to the judge to decide that polarization is bad.

Second Aff: Devin Schurman

I was really impressed by your performance in this round. You set and then implemented the policy framework very well, and your strategic choice to fight for limited solvency gave you a major edge in this round. I would like to see more impacting and weighing of your voters. As I said in feedback, you're winning on polarization, but you're mostly leaving it up to the judge to decide that polarization is bad.

First Neg: Alex Hupe

I was really impressed by your performance in this round. You set and then implemented the policy framework very well, and your strategic choice to fight for limited solvency gave you a major edge in this round. I would like to see more impacting and weighing of your voters. As I said in feedback, you're winning on polarization, but you're mostly leaving it up to the judge to decide that polarization is bad.

Second Neg: N/A

I was really impressed by your performance in this round. You set and then implemented the policy framework very well, and your strategic choice to fight for limited solvency gave you a major edge in this round. I would like to see more impacting and weighing of your voters. As I said in feedback, you're winning on polarization, but you're mostly leaving it up to the judge to decide that polarization is bad.

Judge: Kaeli Meno
Ballot Code: 47

Round: 2

SU Eduard-Strok-Eduard-Strok versus Eduard Strok BSU Eva-Daniels-Eva-Daniels

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This was sort of a messy debate where we got away from the heart of the motion. Given the debate that happened, I found that the NEGATIVE won in today's debate. I thought that their case was clearer and they were effectively able to combat or put doubt in my mind about the AFF's plan. They also offered other causations to the problem that had been identified by the AFF.

First Aff: Eduard Strok

I definitely would encourage this speaker to be more specific with their modeling. From later speeches, it seemed like they had a clear conception of the model they wanted but they didn't expand on it during their first speech.
They were the only speaker in the round to provide the one example that was tossed back and forth with the Colorado vs. Missouri voting systems which were useful to have in the round. I do commend them for that.

Second Aff: Eduard Strok

I definitely would encourage this speaker to be more specific with their modeling. From later speeches, it seemed like they had a clear conception of the model they wanted but they didn't expand on it during their first speech.
They were the only speaker in the round to provide the one example that was tossed back and forth with the Colorado vs. Missouri voting systems which were useful to have in the round. I do commend them for that.

First Neg: Eva Daniels

I definitely would encourage this speaker to be more specific with their modeling. From later speeches, it seemed like they had a clear conception of the model they wanted but they didn't expand on it during their first speech.
They were the only speaker in the round to provide the one example that was tossed back and forth with the Colorado vs. Missouri voting systems which were useful to have in the round. I do commend them for that.

Second Neg: Eva Daniels

I definitely would encourage this speaker to be more specific with their modeling. From later speeches, it seemed like they had a clear conception of the model they wanted but they didn't expand on it during their first speech.
They were the only speaker in the round to provide the one example that was tossed back and forth with the Colorado vs. Missouri voting systems which were useful to have in the round. I do commend them for that.

Judge: Andy Christensen
Ballot Code: 38

Round: 2

UA Geneva Luteria Paul Cosby versus UWB Omar Fageeri Omar Fageeri

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I GAVE AN EXTENSIVE ORAL RESPONSE TO THIS AND THE TOURNAMENT IS RUNNING TOO FAST TODAY FOR ME TO SPEND TIME REPEATING IT HERE.

First Aff: Paul Cosby

You do a really solid job structuring the case and providing a framework which (could have) worked through the entirety of the round. Good signposting, nicely presented. I think the SOLID overview of the conflict was absolutely, but ate into your time. As a suggestion, be cautious with your taglines. I swear at one point you said "violence ends violence" when presenting the voter that your plan (oops) could end vio faster.

Second Aff: Geneva Luteria

You do a really solid job structuring the case and providing a framework which (could have) worked through the entirety of the round. Good signposting, nicely presented. I think the SOLID overview of the conflict was absolutely, but ate into your time. As a suggestion, be cautious with your taglines. I swear at one point you said "violence ends violence" when presenting the voter that your plan (oops) could end vio faster.

First Neg: Omar Fageeri

You do a really solid job structuring the case and providing a framework which (could have) worked through the entirety of the round. Good signposting, nicely presented. I think the SOLID overview of the conflict was absolutely, but ate into your time. As a suggestion, be cautious with your taglines. I swear at one point you said "violence ends violence" when presenting the voter that your plan (oops) could end vio faster.

Second Neg: Omar Fageeri

You do a really solid job structuring the case and providing a framework which (could have) worked through the entirety of the round. Good signposting, nicely presented. I think the SOLID overview of the conflict was absolutely, but ate into your time. As a suggestion, be cautious with your taglines. I swear at one point you said "violence ends violence" when presenting the voter that your plan (oops) could end vio faster.

Judge: Corey Patton
Ballot Code: 36

Round: 2

BSU Elizabeth Bogle versus UA Daewon Hwang & Everett Cason

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff convinced me that there are substantial harms created in the status quo where news media is extremely polarized across political lines. Although I think the amount of solvency this policy gets is marginal, it at least has the potential to move to generate more critical thought and break people out of echo chambers. There seem to be few tangible drawbacks to instituting this policy, even if the FCC has its own allegiance to the political party in control of the federal government. Aff convinced me that any bias the FCC has will be benign because the fairness doctrine, on its face, is designed to counteract bias and there will be limited opportunities to find loopholes around it.

First Aff: Elizabeth

Strong advocacy in your first constructive that laid out several pernicious harms in the status quo, and good turning of some of the Opp's rhetorical arguments. Going forward, it might be good to utilize examples that encompass more integral stakeholders (ex: if it is harder to convince a hard-right conservative to engage with alternative viewpoints, maybe your time is better spent explaining why this policy would be beneficial to moderates who are open to engaging with those myriad viewpoints).

Second Aff: Elizabeth

Strong advocacy in your first constructive that laid out several pernicious harms in the status quo, and good turning of some of the Opp's rhetorical arguments. Going forward, it might be good to utilize examples that encompass more integral stakeholders (ex: if it is harder to convince a hard-right conservative to engage with alternative viewpoints, maybe your time is better spent explaining why this policy would be beneficial to moderates who are open to engaging with those myriad viewpoints).

First Neg: Daewon

Strong advocacy in your first constructive that laid out several pernicious harms in the status quo, and good turning of some of the Opp's rhetorical arguments. Going forward, it might be good to utilize examples that encompass more integral stakeholders (ex: if it is harder to convince a hard-right conservative to engage with alternative viewpoints, maybe your time is better spent explaining why this policy would be beneficial to moderates who are open to engaging with those myriad viewpoints).

Second Neg: Everett

Strong advocacy in your first constructive that laid out several pernicious harms in the status quo, and good turning of some of the Opp's rhetorical arguments. Going forward, it might be good to utilize examples that encompass more integral stakeholders (ex: if it is harder to convince a hard-right conservative to engage with alternative viewpoints, maybe

your time is better spent explaining why this policy would be beneficial to moderates who are open to engaging with those myriad viewpoints).

Judge: Nick Sitzman
Ballot Code: 33

Round: 2

Affirmative UA Henry-MildonHenry-Mildon versus Negative ISU Colter-BarkerJett-Smith6

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I sided with the Negative team because:
I had more confidence in the UN as an actor over the AU because of the evidence of corruption that the NEG team provided. The AFF's defense of the AU saying they have solved similar problems before didn't hold up so well because the NEG pointed out that that happened before the corruption accusations started.
Also, I bought the solvency of the counterplan over the plan. The counterplan was more detailed and felt more directed at bringing long-term peace to the region. Meanwhile, the affirmative plan focused on bringing in military to protect citizens in the short-term and maybe attain peace in the long run. Additionally, the affirmative plan made no mention of Tigray and its military conflict, which seemed to be a major actor in this situation, so it was concerning for me to vote on a plan that didn't involve them at all.
Lastly, I thought the negative did a great job by pointing out that there is already great potential for these countries to solve this themselves in the status quo. The affirmative stressed the urgency to act on this crisis in their first speech, but didn't hammer back at this point that the negative made as much as they needed to.

First Aff: Henry Mildon

You did a really great job of spelling out why military action is warranted in this situation and I thought your organization of your first speech was fantastic. It really aided the presentation of your plan.
However, in later speeches you got really caught up in arguing AU over UN, when I think your time would have been better spent extending your argumentation on military intervention. You argued that your plan would better guarantee immediate protection than the counterplan, but much of this argumentation came much later in the debate and you didn't offer as much detail as to why military intervention was worth the risks of longterm violence the NEG said it was.

Second Aff: N/A

You did a really great job of spelling out why military action is warranted in this situation and I thought your organization of your first speech was fantastic. It really aided the presentation of your plan.
However, in later speeches you got really caught up in arguing AU over UN, when I think your time would have been better spent extending your argumentation on military intervention. You argued that your plan would better guarantee immediate protection than the counterplan, but much of this argumentation came much later in the debate and you didn't offer as much detail as to why military intervention was worth the risks of longterm violence the NEG said it was.

First Neg: Colter Barker

You did a really great job of spelling out why military action is warranted in this situation and I thought your organization of your first speech was fantastic. It really aided the presentation of your plan.
However, in later speeches you got really caught up in arguing AU over UN, when I think your time would have been better spent extending your argumentation on military intervention. You argued that your plan would better guarantee immediate protection than the counterplan, but much of this argumentation came much later in the debate and you didn't offer as much detail as to why military intervention was worth the risks of longterm violence the NEG said it was.

Second Neg: Jett Smith

You did a really great job of spelling out why military action is warranted in this situation and I thought your organization of your first speech was fantastic. It really aided the presentation of your plan.
However, in later speeches you got really caught up in arguing AU over UN, when I think your time would have been better spent extending your argumentation on military intervention. You argued that your plan would better guarantee immediate protection than the counterplan, but much of this argumentation came much later in the debate and you didn't offer as much detail as to why military intervention was worth the risks of longterm violence the NEG said it was.

Round: 2

Trent Mckenzie versus Lucy Manning, Rishona Raub

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff was more clear on the flow, clear clash and signposting, and won the values debate with greater certainty on numbers of lives saved, as well as tighter definition of international intervention (UN) and verifiable estimate of solvency in this specific regional conflict.
Neg presented compelling arguments and offered great information and perspective on some risk of regional spillover and exacerbating local resentments, but this mostly assumed US as the international agent, or was ambiguous, while Aff was clear about UN role, capacity for solvency and track record, then was just really clear about impacting the numbers of refugee lives impacted into the values debate (life). Aff flow clarity made this easier for me to comprehend in general.

First Aff: Trent Mckenzie

Clear 1AC. Set a strong backbone for the rest of the flow.
Carried the structural debate for me to the end with clear impacts on both values as a voting issue, and verifiable solvency of defined actor (UN) as serving both policy advantage and values re: lives saved, particularly refugees. Great job

Second Aff: Trent Mckenzie

Clear 1AC. Set a strong backbone for the rest of the flow.
Carried the structural debate for me to the end with clear impacts on both values as a voting issue, and verifiable solvency of defined actor (UN) as serving both policy advantage and values re: lives saved, particularly refugees. Great job

First Neg: Lucy Manning

Clear 1AC. Set a strong backbone for the rest of the flow.
Carried the structural debate for me to the end with clear impacts on both values as a voting issue, and verifiable solvency of defined actor (UN) as serving both policy advantage and values re: lives saved, particularly refugees. Great job

Second Neg: Rishona Raub

Clear 1AC. Set a strong backbone for the rest of the flow.
Carried the structural debate for me to the end with clear impacts on both values as a voting issue, and verifiable solvency of defined actor (UN) as serving both policy advantage and values re: lives saved, particularly refugees. Great job

Round: 3

UA Henry-MildonHenry-Mildon versus DU Alayna-Trier-Alex-Spencer

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Neg failed to meet define advocacy well enough to substantiate their arguments. On one hand, I have this idea of "american values" which is broadly distilled as individualism, and aff succinctly proves how they win. On the other hand, I have this idea of efficacy, but I don't think the neg adequately proves that status quo accomplishes any modicum of efficacy, and they fail to properly refute aff's analysis that people tend to fall through the cracks of MTW.
COVID point was also awarded to aff due to lack of adequate response of current COVID econ issues and discussion of businesses closing/etc..,

First Aff: Henry Mildon

COMPLIMENT: Thorough, concise and unique modeling, very solid, great illustrations of economic status quo. Clearly you have an amazing grasp of economic theory.
IMPROVEMENT: Stronger evidence or rebuilding would be advantageous with regards to the principles of individual spending. Neg is hammering on the idea that people tend to be unreliable with their money. I want to see further evidence that states the opposite to help you win this point beyond the singular and quickly referenced example from Sweden on employment.

Second Aff: NA

COMPLIMENT: Thorough, concise and unique modeling, very solid, great illustrations of economic status quo. Clearly you have an amazing grasp of economic theory.
IMPROVEMENT: Stronger evidence or rebuilding would be advantageous with regards to the principles of individual spending. Neg is hammering on the idea that people tend to be unreliable with their money. I want to see further evidence that states the opposite to help you win this point beyond the singular and quickly referenced example from Sweden on employment.

First Neg: Alayna Trier

COMPLIMENT: Thorough, concise and unique modeling, very solid, great illustrations of economic status quo. Clearly you have an amazing grasp of economic theory.
IMPROVEMENT: Stronger evidence or rebuilding would be advantageous with regards to the principles of individual spending. Neg is hammering on the idea that people tend to be unreliable with their money. I want to see further evidence that states the opposite to help you win this point beyond the singular and quickly referenced example from Sweden on employment.

Second Neg: Alex Spencer

COMPLIMENT: Thorough, concise and unique modeling, very solid, great illustrations of economic status quo. Clearly you have an amazing grasp of economic theory.

IMPROVEMENT: Stronger evidence or rebuilding would be advantageous with regards to the principles of individual spending. Neg is hammering on the idea that people tend to be unreliable with their money. I want to see further evidence that states the opposite to help you win this point beyond the singular and quickly referenced example from Sweden on employment.

Judge: Robert Hockema
Ballot Code: 70

Round: 3

BSU Mariah-Bowman-Mariah-Bowman versus CMain Madalyn-Bond-Madalyn-Bond

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: This is a close debate that comes down to engagement on the flow. Both teams have great arguments, and I think the debate ultimately comes down to whether or not private school is worth the extra money and costs to society (public school defunding).
On this, there are three mini-debates happening.
1. The quality of teaching (class sizes, qualifications, curriculum)
 I buy Neg's argument that small class sizes are generally better for students. However, the debate that further develops is about the quality of that time. Aff asserts that because qualifications are legally lax by the state (which, factually, is generally true), to which a call for more evidence was made by the Neg. Im not persuaded by many of the evidence debates happening in this round, especially since some semantic claims on the Neg are left unwarranted as well (for instances, it was never actually "proven" that class sizes are smaller, but its a general assumption about private school we respect). So, I'm left with a solvent response from the aff that goes unresponded to. So, the class size issue becomes an Aff issue or at worst a wash. The same goes for graduation rates: even if I buy that, aff responses by saying it doesn't matter if students are graduating from a private school that promotes bad educational practices.
2. The safety of schools
This portion of the debate is difficult to adjudicate. I think Aff does enough to convince me that public schools probably report higher rates of crime, especially larger ones in urban centers with statistically high rates of crime already. I think its fair that parents want to keep their kids safe. Neg's points about safety for marginalized communities stands, but purely based on weighing, aff takes more practical advantage.

First Aff: Mariah Bowman

Your intuitive reasoning/rebuttal skills are careful and effective. I think some of your claims need work or at least some evidence and analysis -- i.e. that private teachers are less likely to be qualified, or that students from marginalized communities experience disproportionate bullying in private school. However, the terminal end of these claims makes for some really smart turns against the Negs arguments. Fill in the blanks on the claims we talked about during oral feedback and you'll get the Neg off your back asking you to show a card for a claim you're making.

Second Aff: --

Your intuitive reasoning/rebuttal skills are careful and effective. I think some of your claims need work or at least some evidence and analysis -- i.e. that private teachers are less likely to be qualified, or that students from marginalized communities experience disproportionate bullying in private school. However, the terminal end of these claims makes for some really smart turns against the Negs arguments. Fill in the blanks on the claims we talked about during oral feedback and you'll get the Neg off your back asking you to show a card for a claim you're making.

First Neg: Madalyn Bond

Your intuitive reasoning/rebuttal skills are careful and effective. I think some of your claims need work or at least some evidence and analysis -- i.e. that private teachers are less likely to be qualified, or that students from marginalized communities experience disproportionate bullying in private school. However, the terminal end of these claims makes for some really smart turns against the Negs arguments. Fill in the blanks on the claims we talked about during oral feedback and you'll get the Neg off your back asking you to show a card for a claim you're making.

Second Neg: --

Your intuitive reasoning/rebuttal skills are careful and effective. I think some of your claims need work or at least some evidence and analysis -- i.e. that private teachers are less likely to be qualified, or that students from marginalized communities experience disproportionate bullying in private school. However, the terminal end of these claims makes for some really smart turns against the Negs arguments. Fill in the blanks on the claims we talked about during oral feedback and you'll get the Neg off your back asking you to show a card for a claim you're making.

Judge: Kaeli Meno
Ballot Code: 54

Round: 3

ISU Joseph-TylerJoseph-Tyler6 versus BSU Elizabeth-BogleElizabeth-Bogle

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: This was a wonderful and close debate. You both are talented speakers and gave me a lot to consider. Ultimately I sided that this was an AFF win given that they were able to provide a solution to this problem with minimal harm. I think that when the Aff was able to tie the Neg to the status quo it really harmed their case, and made it difficult to say that what we were currently doing was the best way to solve.

First Aff: Joseph Tyler

Out of a lot of the speeches I've seen today you had the cleanest first AFF speech. I thought that you set up a fair debate, have a decent model, and had a structure that was easy to follow.
I thought that you could have utilized your first cross-examination a little more. A lot of your questions were resource based, which is understandable, but I would have tried to go a little more in depth on the points the Neg had presented.

Second Aff: Joseph Tyler

Out of a lot of the speeches I've seen today you had the cleanest first AFF speech. I thought that you set up a fair debate, have a decent model, and had a structure that was easy to follow.
I thought that you could have utilized your first cross-examination a little more. A lot of your questions were resource based, which is understandable, but I would have tried to go a little more in depth on the points the Neg had presented.

First Neg: Elizabeth Bogle

Out of a lot of the speeches I've seen today you had the cleanest first AFF speech. I thought that you set up a fair debate, have a decent model, and had a structure that was easy to follow.
I thought that you could have utilized your first cross-examination a little more. A lot of your questions were resource based, which is understandable, but I would have tried to go a little more in depth on the points the Neg had presented.

Second Neg: Elizabeth Bogle

Out of a lot of the speeches I've seen today you had the cleanest first AFF speech. I thought that you set up a fair debate, have a decent model, and had a structure that was easy to follow.
I thought that you could have utilized your first cross-examination a little more. A lot of your questions were resource based, which is understandable, but I would have tried to go a little more in depth on the points the Neg had presented.

Judge: Greg Foster
Ballot Code: 55

Round: 3

UA Athenia-LargeDakota-Seibert versus HP Devin-SchurmanParker-Brown

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Very slim round. I honestly though the negative did a better performance throughout the round, but lacked impacts for me to weigh as a judge. Ultimately, the neg is suggesting the aff plan shouldn't be implemented because it is vague, doesn't go far enough and has no net benefits to the economy because of inflation. These were all solid arguments, but not impacted throughout the round as a net harm of the affirmative or reasons to reject the aff. The neg came through arguing the aff had no net benefit. However, the aff was persuasive and worked through the arguments to suggest clearly there is some net benefit, even if it is small. In other words, I though most of the negative time was spent on minimizing the benefits of the aff rather than rejecting them, and the aff was able to prove there is some reason to accept the plan, so I vote aff.

First Aff: Athena Large

I liked your constructive speech and thought you provided a persuasive case tapping into the morals behind a UBI. I would suggest working on cross examination, specifically trying to address points in your opponent's case rather than trying to advance your own points with not so direct questions.

Second Aff: Dakota Seibert

I liked your constructive speech and thought you provided a persuasive case tapping into the morals behind a UBI. I would suggest working on cross examination, specifically trying to address points in your opponent's case rather than trying to advance your own points with not so direct questions.

First Neg: Devin Schurman

I liked your constructive speech and thought you provided a persuasive case tapping into the morals behind a UBI. I would suggest working on cross examination, specifically trying to address points in your opponent's case rather than trying to advance your own points with not so direct questions.

Second Neg: Parker Brown

I liked your constructive speech and thought you provided a persuasive case tapping into the morals behind a UBI. I would suggest working on cross examination, specifically trying to address points in your opponent's case rather than trying to advance your own points with not so direct questions.

Judge: Gabriel Neuman
Ballot Code: 61

Round: 3

Affirmative BSU Alex-HupeAlex-Hupe versus Negative UA Geneva-LuteriaPaul-Cosby

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Ultimately I gave the win to the neg because they presented clear harms to the economy if this were to occur, and I thought Affirmative did not give a sufficient plan or answer to these issues. Both teams were great speakers and had a good grasp of their evidence.

First Aff: Alex Hupe

Alex, great speaking style and you have great intuition in highlighting the real issues at hand here. In the future you could improve by having a clearer plan (or just phrasing the debate as a normative one to avoid that issue) and by talking more about the human element of the policy, which could preclude a lot of the offensive from neg about how it gets rid of group specific welfare.

Second Aff: Alex Hupe

Alex, great speaking style and you have great intuition in highlighting the real issues at hand here. In the future you could improve by having a clearer plan (or just phrasing the debate as a normative one to avoid that issue) and by talking more about the human element of the policy, which could preclude a lot of the offensive from neg about how it gets rid of group specific welfare.

First Neg: Geneva Luteria

Alex, great speaking style and you have great intuition in highlighting the real issues at hand here. In the future you could improve by having a clearer plan (or just phrasing the debate as a normative one to avoid that issue) and by talking more about the human element of the policy, which could preclude a lot of the offensive from neg about how it gets rid of group specific welfare.

Second Neg: Paul Cosby

Alex, great speaking style and you have great intuition in highlighting the real issues at hand here. In the future you could improve by having a clearer plan (or just phrasing the debate as a normative one to avoid that issue) and by talking more about the human element of the policy, which could preclude a lot of the offensive from neg about how it gets rid of group specific welfare.

Judge: Nick Sitzman
Ballot Code: 67

Round: 3

FSU Anisa-LynomAnisa-Lynom versus SU Eduard-StrokEduard-Strok

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I ultimately sided with the negative team, because while the counterplan was vague in its design like the affirmative plan, it addressed for the issue of raised taxes hurting small businesses and individuals. This was an argument that the affirmative team dropped entirely.

First Aff: Anisa Lynom

You designed a really great first speech. Your contentions were all logical and your plan solved for them really well.
Work on using your time better in your other speeches throughout the debate. You spent much of your speeches here reading directly from different web pages about UBI, and the content you were reading usually didn't really address your opponent's arguments. I think this time could have been better spent weighing their plan against yours and showing why your plan was superior.

Second Aff: N/A

You designed a really great first speech. Your contentions were all logical and your plan solved for them really well.
Work on using your time better in your other speeches throughout the debate. You spent much of your speeches here reading directly from different web pages about UBI, and the content you were reading usually didn't really address your opponent's arguments. I think this time could have been better spent weighing their plan against yours and showing why your plan was superior.

First Neg: Eduard Strok

You designed a really great first speech. Your contentions were all logical and your plan solved for them really well.
Work on using your time better in your other speeches throughout the debate. You spent much of your speeches here reading directly from different web pages about UBI, and the content you were reading usually didn't really address your opponent's arguments. I think this time could have been better spent weighing their plan against yours and showing why your plan was superior.

Second Neg: N/A

You designed a really great first speech. Your contentions were all logical and your plan solved for them really well.
Work on using your time better in your other speeches throughout the debate. You spent much of your speeches here reading directly from different web pages about UBI, and the content you were reading usually didn't really address your opponent's arguments. I think

this time could have been better spent weighing their plan against yours and showing why your plan was superior.

Judge: Andy Christensen
Ballot Code: 68

Round: 3

Affirmative BSU Eva-DanielsEva-Daniels: versus Negative NDSU Jack-LawThomas-Ohmann:

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I've already provided an extensive rfp to the speakers. I decline to repeat that here.

First Aff: Eva Daniels

The gentrification argument was absolutely fantastic. Particularly deeper ties into HARM would have been beneficial. Supporting details, documentation, that would have really made the case at the level where the neg can't refute as easily as they did.

Second Aff: Eva Daniels

The gentrification argument was absolutely fantastic. Particularly deeper ties into HARM would have been beneficial. Supporting details, documentation, that would have really made the case at the level where the neg can't refute as easily as they did.

First Neg: Jack Law

The gentrification argument was absolutely fantastic. Particularly deeper ties into HARM would have been beneficial. Supporting details, documentation, that would have really made the case at the level where the neg can't refute as easily as they did.

Second Neg: Thomas Ohmann

The gentrification argument was absolutely fantastic. Particularly deeper ties into HARM would have been beneficial. Supporting details, documentation, that would have really made the case at the level where the neg can't refute as easily as they did.

Judge: Corey Patton
Ballot Code: 60

Round: 3

HP Lucy Manning & Rishona Raub versus UA Casi LeBlanc & Cora Lyon

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I was convinced by Aff's argument that private schools exacerbate socioeconomic disparities, even if public schools also experience such disparities to a high degree. Although the Opp made a compelling argument about private schools having the ability to customize their curriculums in ways publics schools cannot, most of the analysis was done from the perspective of the parent, and there was sufficient refutation from the Aff addressing why parental rights shouldn't be inherently valued.

First Aff: Lucy

Well-researched case, and excellent delivery! Great series of questions during CX as well. My only suggestion would be to be wary of conceding too much ground to the opposing team, especially in a round that is based on weighing net benefits.

Second Aff: Rishona

Well-researched case, and excellent delivery! Great series of questions during CX as well. My only suggestion would be to be wary of conceding too much ground to the opposing team, especially in a round that is based on weighing net benefits.

First Neg: Cora

Well-researched case, and excellent delivery! Great series of questions during CX as well. My only suggestion would be to be wary of conceding too much ground to the opposing team, especially in a round that is based on weighing net benefits.

Second Neg: Casi

Well-researched case, and excellent delivery! Great series of questions during CX as well. My only suggestion would be to be wary of conceding too much ground to the opposing team, especially in a round that is based on weighing net benefits.