# VPD

## Varsity Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 911</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong>&lt;br&gt;(circle)</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;1st 2nd Shion Wagoner&lt;br&gt;2nd Lleyton Ito&lt;br&gt;29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1-4) <strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong>&lt;br&gt;(circle)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;1st 2nd Grant Gaylord&lt;br&gt;2nd Shikhar Srivastava&lt;br&gt;25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Voted Neg on FW; TVA specifically

Judge's Signature

Hamilton High School / Affiliation / Occupation
VARIRGALIEI, PHILIP

VPD

Varsity Policy Debate                      Philip Birgenheir (*'25)

Round 1                                    Room 912                          Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM

Speaker (circle)                          Speaker (circle)
(3) 2nd Chase Laibe                      (3) 1st Aatmak Mallya
(1) 1st 2nd Jadon Grossberg              (1) 1st 2nd Greg Miller
29 Desert Vista High School               35 Hamilton High School

Affirmative                                Negative
Rank        Points          Rank        Points
(1-4)       (20-30)        (1-4)        (20-30)
2          28              3          27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative   Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Y

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2AC - slow down on case overview - you had extra time
    b/c you went too fast

It seems like the SQ does not solve the harms expressed
in the IAC. i.e., the current programs in place
aren't sufficient to cover marginalized youth.
Even if DeVos kills funding in other areas, maybe
the Aff will still solve.

No demonstrated in-round abuse from R1. Aff
got or claimed no offense from it. Even if R1 nets
do higher cs, it doesn't explode research burden.

I think the key did the cleaner debating and
speaking, thus higher speaker
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Andrew Crusa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Lena Angela Han</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Aman Agarwal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Jane Wang</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**.

Is this a low point win? **No**.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Aff took out neg of free and outweighed on meritorious and timeframe.*