

Policy Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Judge _____
 Affirmative Code _____ Negative Code _____

RATE each debater by taking into consideration each debaters' individual performance using the following scale:

SUPERIOR **EXCELLENT** **GOOD**
 40 39 38 37 36 35 34 33 32

*Judges may rate debaters on delivery, logic, evidence, refutation, cross-examination, and/or ethics

RANK each debater in order of excellence: 1 for best, 2 next best, etc. no ties allowed) Ranking should be consistent with debater points.

First Affirmative RASMUSSEN

RATE (40-32) 35 RANK 1-2-(3)-4

Comments:

- +SPEAK LOUDER!
- +KNOW YOUR CASE (FLOWING, TEXT, etc...)
- +READ THE TABS FOR YOUR CARDS BEFORE YOU READ THE COTES.
- +BETTER VOLUME AND SPEED IN THE 1AR.
- +ON (T) YOUR ARGUMENTS ARE UNFORTUNATELY TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

First Negative NICHOLS

RATE (40-32) 36 RANK 1-(2)-3-4

Comments:

- +LINK ON SPENDING NEEDS TO BE SHORTER, RE-CUT CARD TO MAKE NECESSARIES.
- +STARTS OUT WEAK ON (T) A LITTLE MORE, SPECIFICALLY ON ED, MAKE THIS AS HOT AS YOU CAN.
- +BESTEST PROBLEM - ON CASE, GOOD MUST. I WANT YOUR SOLVENCY UNDER ALL OF THE INHERENCY PAGE.
- +GO FASTER THROUGH CONCEPT POSITIONS IN THE 1AR, LEAVE THE SPENDING.

Second Affirmative LARSEN

RATE (40-32) 35 RANK 1-2-3-(4)

Comments:

- +NEED INTERACTION IN YOUR CARDS AND THE NEG'S ARGUMENTS. DON'T JUST READ CARDS, PROVIDE ORIGINAL ANSWERS
- +I DON'T GET THE 2AC STRAT. WORK ON RESPONDING TO THE NEG'S SPECIFIC ARG LIKE (T), SPENDING, + RESEARCH + DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS IN YOUR SPEECH.
- +TAKE SOME PREP AND MAKE GOOD ARG.
- +DON'T LET THE 2AC DOMINATE YOUR CO-TERM.

Second Negative LAWRENCE

RATE (40-32) 37 RANK (1)-2-3-4


Comments:

- +YOU CAN GO A LOT QUICKER THROUGH (T). JUST "EXTEND" AND MOVE ON, OR SIT DOWN.
- +GREAT ANALYSES ON THE ECON PAGE WITH THE ACB AND MTD ANALOGIES.
- +CAREFUL WITH YOUR STRATEGIC CONCESSIONS, CONSIDER COUNTER SCENARIOS, NOT ENTIRE ADVANTAGES.

Decision based on: (considerations may include: topicality, harms, inherency, solvency, advantages, disadvantages, etc.)

I VOTE ON (T) BECAUSE I THINK THIS (T) IS PRETTY SILLY, AFF DOESN'T DO THE WORK ON THE FLOW TO MAKE ME TO GET PAST THE (T) AND EVALUATE CASE.

Speech Times	
1AC	8min
EX	3min
1NC	8min
EX	3min
2AC	8min
EX	3min
2NC	8min
EX	3min
1NR	5min
1AR	5min
2NR	5min
2AR	5min
Prep	5min


 Signature

Decision in favor of: **AFF** NEG Code REN NL
 (circle) Debate Code Violation? **
 If an Idaho Debate Code violation occurs, mark the violation, judge the round regardless, then inform and confer with the tab room upon completion of the round.

Galaviz, M

REN TS vs MTN V HK
Room: C 101 Start: 8:00 am
Novice Policy -- Rd 1

Policy Debate Ballot

Round 1 Room C101 Judge _____
Affirmative Code _____ Negative Code MTN V HK

RATE each debater by taking into consideration each debaters' individual performance using the following scale:

SUPERIOR **EXCELLENT** **GOOD** *Judges may rate debaters on delivery, logic, evidence,
40 39 38 **37 36 35** **34 33 32** refutation, cross-examination, and/or ethics

RANK each debater in order of excellence: 1 for best, 2 next best, etc. no ties allowed) Ranking should be consistent with debater points.

First Affirmative _____ RATE (40-32) _____ RANK 1-2-3-4 Comments: <i>No slow</i>	First Negative _____ RATE (40-32) _____ RANK 1-2-3-4 Comments:
Second Affirmative _____ RATE (40-32) _____ RANK 1-2-3-4 Comments: <i>No slow</i>	Second Negative _____ RATE (40-32) _____ RANK 1-2-3-4 Comments: <i>No slow</i>

Decision based on: (considerations may include: topicality, harms, inherency, solvency, advantages, disadvantages, etc.)

Speech Times	
IAC	8min
CX	3min
INC	8min
CX	3min
2AC	8min
CX	3min
2NC	8min
CX	3min
1NR	5min
1AR	5min
2NR	5min
2AR	5min
Prep	5min

No slow
No slow
No slow
No slow

Signature _____

Decision in favor of: **AFF** (circle) **NEG** Code MTN V HK
 If an Idaho Debate Code violation occurs, mark the violation, judge the round regardless, then inform and confer with the tab room upon completion of the round. Debate Code Violation? **

Bruun

Mudd, M

Policy Debate Ballot

WR NL vs REN GD
Room: C 105 Start: 8:00 am
Novice Policy -- Rd 1

Round _____ Room _____ Judge _____

Affirmative Code WRNL Negative Code Ren CD

RATE each debater by taking into consideration each debaters' individual performance using the following scale:

SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

*Judges may rate debaters on delivery, logic, evidence, refutation, cross-examination, and/or ethics

RANK each debater in order of excellence: 1 for best, 2 next best, etc. no ties allowed) Ranking should be consistent with debater points.

First Affirmative Lapa

First Negative Durbin

RATE (40-32) 36 RANK 1-2-3-4

RATE (40-32) 37 RANK 1-2-3-4

Comments: IAC is pretty good, but plan text in the last 30 seconds is confusing. Your solvency arguments are all presented before I know what your text is. Consider restructuring the case. Be confident in CX - you have the answers to his questions in your case, don't be intimidated.

Comments: Make 1 A priori. Always. It takes 5 seconds, and will be very helpful if you need to go for it. Nice signposting - you have pretty good organization. You should tell me which solvency points your solvency block applies to. Also many of your 2 takeouts were actually inherency attacks - extend dropped 1 in the WR!

Second Affirmative Lapa

Second Negative Gordon

RATE (40-32) 34 RANK 1-2-3-4

RATE (40-32) 37 RANK 1-2-3-4

Comments: Give me a roadmap at the start of your speech and repeat as much as possible. Do not leave me to assume where your arguments belong. You should answer 1 first, most judges assume it is A priori. USE your time! you have 4 minutes left and your case answers their DAs. Some of their DAs don't even make sense - use your time to point this out. Decision based on: (considerations may include: topicality, harms, inherency, solvency, advantages, disadvantages, etc.)

Comments: If you kick a DA that your opponent did not even mention, then it was probably not a good idea to run it in the first place. You do a good job extending 1s on the spending DA, but explain why these extensions take out the aff's answers (they do). You basically repeat the IAC, you should be telling me why these drops make the 2AC irrelevant. Also, try hard to not take prep in the middle of the Neg block, it gives the Aff free prep against the 2AC

Speech Times	
IAC	3min
CX	3min
INC	3min
CX	3min
2AC	3min
CX	3min
2NC	3min
CX	3min
1NR	3min
1AR	3min
2NR	5min
2AR	5min
Prep	5min

1 - The easiest place to vote in this round is on 1 - neg shells out a coherent 1, and the aff does not respond. Even though it was not made A priori, it is an easy impact to vote for (education and fairness). I voted here.

\$ DA - The spending DA was pretty good, you guys seem to understand it fairly well. The Aff does make some answers here however. The problem is that neither side analyzes how these contrary claims interact. The Aff claims that future costs will be much worse than current ones, and that the deficit more. The Neg claims that our current "discipline" is broken by ↑ infrastructure spending. I needed someone to tell me why their argument was more important. This did not happen. This is an area where both sides could improve in future rounds.

oil 1 - This DA wasn't very good, the internal link story was very weak. I am glad the Neg kicked it even though it was dropped. Aff could have dealt with this DA very easily.

2 and 1 - This debate was pretty good. Most of the clash occurred here. 1 would have liked to see Aff use the IAC to answer back some 1 of the Neg claims, it would have worked in this specific instance. Overall, Neg was winning. Inherency and Solvency was in question for the Aff.

Decision in favor of:

AFF **NEG** Code Ren CD

If an Idaho Debate Code violation occurs, mark the violation, judge the round regardless, then inform and confer with the tab room upon completion of the round.

Johnston

Johnson, J

Policy Debate Ballot

REN BT vs BOR HF
Room: C 100 Start: 8:00 am
Novice Policy - Rd 1

Round 1

Room C100

Judge _____

Affirmative Code REN BT

Negative Code BOR HF

RATE each debater by taking into consideration each debaters' individual performance using the following scale:

SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

*Judges may rate debaters on delivery, logic, evidence, refutation, cross-examination, and/or ethics

RANK each debater in order of excellence: 1 for best, 2 next best, etc. no ties allowed) Ranking should be consistent with debater points.

First Affirmative Farmer

First Negative Farmer

RATE (40-32) 34 Beringer RANK 1-2-3-4

RATE (40-32) 37 RANK 1-2-3-4

Comments: Repeat plan text for clarity. Don't be afraid to ask for explanations. you ask for repeats, but you don't push the weak points hard enough.

Comments: Signpost your DA better. Spend more time on Link/less on Impact. Good job handling Cx.

Second Affirmative Tiffany

Second Negative Hanson

RATE (40-32) 38 RANK 1-2-3-4

RATE (40-32) 35 RANK 1-2-3-4

Comments: Good use of prep time. Strong rebuttal, but needs more analysis.

Comments: Great Cx question. "How" is your friend. They do address the resolution, keep track of it better.

Decision based on: (considerations may include: topicality, harms, inherency, solvency, advantages, disadvantages, etc.)

Not buying the T. Resolution is USFG. Also, increase investment doesn't need the same investment. Cost DA is huge, and hardly addressed. I want more analysis from both sides. Cite your source, then tell me exactly why that evidence matters. Tell me the story, not just the number. The definition for "invest" should have been laid out early in 1AC, esp if it was going to be argued. Plan needs work, time frame is important. Not a deal breaker, but it matters.

Speech Times	
IAC	8min
CX	3min
1NC	8min
CX	3min
2AC	8min
CX	3min
2NC	8min
CX	3min
1NR	5min
1AR	5min
2NR	5min
2AR	5min
Prep	5min

Aff: It's about spending. Tell me why it needs to be spent. Talk taxes + jobs.

Regan Johnston
Signature

Decision in favor of: **AFF** **NEG** Code BOR HF

If an Idaho Debate Code violation occurs, mark the violation, judge the round regardless, then inform and confer with the tab room upon completion of the round.