### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Spencer (KWIT)</th>
<th>Hyle Henden 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2227</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennett David Fees 9 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sydney Scheller 4 Basis Mesa</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative [ ] Negative [ ]

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:05

RF D.

Both teams failed to provide adequate comparable material to evaluate outgroup composition. Mike's weight on scope & magnitude impossible. Thus, AFF's wedge mechanism of predictability flow through. APP also argued that the SOC helps colleges more. This paradox in the APP's argument damages his claim of predictability. Impacts of structural damage flow through both cases, thus leaving no societal benefits to an APP or a SQ world. Thus flows to the NEG and the impacts of the Admin Office to win the round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Sofia Hidalgo ('13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2228</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaney Krieger</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratik Shah</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- [ ] Affirmative
- [x] Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**
- Signpost a little more so I know which contentions to drop
- Address why util wasn't used when speaking on evening
- Block/flow all contentions

**NEG**
- Address every contention so aff can't flow it throughout the round if you can
- Address her holistic argument
- Block/flow all contentions
- Just bloc aff says you can't speak on an argument/topic doesn't mean you can't say you already addressed it

**RED**
- Affirmative won Fw
- Burden of alt to have diff way of testing
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Saul Grajales (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara Korpe</td>
<td>Mia Lupica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg because the disc and squo outweighs the benefits of an affirmative. I think the aff needs to do a better job of putting more offense against the disc as there is no real reason given in round as to why standardized testing is worse.

Additional comments were given in round.

bsummer16 @ brophybronzes.org
### VLD

**Varsity Lincoln Douglas** | **Charina Tcscon** 13
---|---
**Round 2** | **Room 2219**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points 20 (&lt;25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points 26 (&lt;25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanisha Bhattacharya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Great job!!** So great to see more girls in VLD!!!

Have fun <3 Good luck

---

**Aff!**

- You know your case well.
- Great job asking answering in CX
- Keep in mind throughout the debate — it's a value debate — bring up your values or CR throughout the round. (Why is it more relevant to debate? Why are you winning under it?) OR! Why are you winning under both frameworks if time!!
- Flow all your arguments through!!! Even if it's just to extend! (I know that 4 minute speech is super short but if you don't extend your contentions, they can help you win)

**Neg!**

- Great CX questions
- Excellent evidence!
- Value debate!! refer to your value or CR — it is exclusive to you in this round — it can help you win if you prove its better!!
- One new argument in the 2MR
- Organize your speech according to your roadmap — so the judge can flow (will make your arguments understandable + make for a better debate)

---

In general:

- No looking at your opponent during CX
- Aff ultimately won because value & evidence stacked up
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>JOSEPH BALIAN</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2218</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayush Kothari</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rio Pham</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Basis Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**GREAT JOB BY BOTH DEBATES. BOTH BROUGHT UP SOME REAL INTERESTING POINTS.**

**AYUSH BROUGHT UP A GOOD POINT ABOUT HOW A STUDENT'S HIGH-SCHOOL CAREER IS SUMMED UP IN ONE TEST.**

**RIO HAD NO REBUTTLE FOR THIS.**

**RIO BROUGHT UP GOOD POINTS TOO...**

**LIKE - RESOURCES FOR STANDARDIZED TEST TAKING LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD BUT... I DON'T DO BELIEVE THOSE SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS HAVE MORE TO WORRY ABOUT WHICH CAN IMPACT THEIR FUTURE, INCLUDING STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES.**

**/S /BASIS PHOENIX JOURNALISM**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Judge's Signature
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Anmarie Stone (*20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td>Ved Prashant Patil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30) 28</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Is this a low point win? **NO**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You are very well prepared and you had some great rebuttals to the Aff. Your delivery is a little rushed and hard to differentiate between your arguments. I don't think I really understood everything you tried to lay out.
- You said your burden was to disprove the Aff and you might have... I'm sorry I don't 100% know what consequentialism is. Minimizing oppression seems to have gotten lost...
- Is consequentialism the stuff about policy makers + data + funding -- that was good.
- You are too smart for me to understand you! Dumb it down for me.

Win goes to Aff - mostly because she was able to plainly & simply defend the position. She showed that there were lots of other ways for colleges to evaluate + they knew of disadvantages of some schools + weighted accordingly.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Eli Botham (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adyant Mishra</td>
<td>Saif Agha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

McClintock HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Good move: you prove that for time strategy
- Good move to prove empires attacking the warrant in CX.
- Not enough of a response to the holistic turn. We went into a debate about GPA initiation and artificially reported higher grades but at the end of the day, the same oppressive structure developed. Sign posting was difficult for me to follow around GPA, which you claim it more holistic.
- The weighing underneath probability was good because it provides reason as to why minorities concretely have relatively better grades, though upon examination of the De Boer card after the round, the structure of oppression IS NOT being solved for.
- Overall, I think you could have won if you had gone for the arguments that you brought up in cross - like how the Aff is not savory for everything, but something.
- Go for more specific on case attacks on the Aff. I need a clearer picture of the turn. It only became clearer for me during CX.
- Also, be careful about what you're defending. Nez defends status quo.
- Have a warrant for how you minimize structural violence better.
- I don't understand the util arg. You should read a definition of util in order to go for this argument.
- I'd like to see a better warrant for the aggregate and average card. I think that Adyant could have made an arg. here about lack of warrant regarding objectivity of standardized testing.
- If Adyant had extended this arg from CX and attached the objectivity 9.7, he would have won.

An idea: Find a different specific advocacy for what holistic means, to delink you from defending GPA.

Also, Adyant, go for the argument that standardized tests ARE NOT objective! (say those words) and explain/extend why in order to prove an argument that you didn't.
**OCA, WAYNE MONTES DE**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Wayne Montes de Oca (*'21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2222</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegan Crabtree</td>
<td>Raunak Deb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **AFF** was extremely convincing
- Well poised and GREAT passion!
- Tripped on thoughts too fast.
- Very clear points! Evidence specific and relevant.
- Attack very successful!
- Very organized thoughts
- Very composed/confident
- Very passionate/convincing.
- Evidence well ordered to claim.
- Used gestures to persuade and engage
- Good evidence, Not very persuasive.
- Seemed battled during cross, no card?
- Not very confident.
- Very methodical and calculated.
- Seemed very nervous.
- Flow was choppy through debate.
- Great demeanor!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Neel Chakkerar (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 2232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Lifshitz</td>
<td>Zhenni Gao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

**AFF** Courses should **not** consider standardized tests during admission processes.

**POSITIVE**:
- Clear articulation of **AFF** argument
- Good points about some weaknesses of standardized tests
- Strong evidence/more sources
- Delivery was more professional and articulate
- Clarity of organization was better

**NEGATIVE**:
- Stretching credibility about equating testing with racism
- Testing and monitoring are not mutually exclusive
- Weak correlation of "white middle class" to doing well on tests, what about charter schools in inner cities claiming via test scores.

**POSITIVE**:
- Good cross exam of two main
  - vs. **AFF**
- Good points about more
  - obj. clarity
  - Good point about test scores
- Front runner 
  - strong rebuttals

**NEGATIVE**:
- Cross exam could be more elaborate
- Not much evidence
- Weak rebuttals
- Beguiling some arguments
- Delivery was choppy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Sarah Nicoll (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carter Miller</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **no**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both had great cases.
- Argumentation based on last card mentioned didn't carry the same weight with me as you put on it.
- Really like the idea behind it.
- Good presentation
- Good argumentation
## VLD

**Varsity Lincoln Douglas** | **Jennifer Scott ("2")**
---|---
**Round 2** | **Room 2220** | **Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM**

### Affirmative Points (25-30)

- Calvin Tyler
- 9 Brophy College Prep
- 29

### Negative Points (25-30)

- Ezri Tyler
- 20 Sunnyslope High School
- 98½

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

- No

**Judge's Signature**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Great speaking, and clarity of your argument.
- Constructive
- A little unclear at first, but once you got rolling it was clear and √ all the boxes.
- Both of you had great rebuttals and they were very persuasive. I truly was going back and forth on all your arguments. I guess what got me was the actual 3 studies and the college that tried it, along with the closing statements of GPA already evaluated on context of the school.
- I enjoyed listening to this debate.

**AFF won.**
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Bita Taji (*'2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>Lucas Grajales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**

Good job identifying weak points.

Able to respond quickly and thoroughly to questions.

Good attack on Neg's value.

Your language is very clear.

**Neg**

Strong advocacy of Neg's position

I like your use of utilitarianism value

Try to make eye contact with judge makes strong points.

Clear and eloquent language
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Derek Chisum (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohani Sandhu</td>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points
- **Affirmative** 29
- **Negative** 29

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Case is very heavy on the 1st contention, which I felt might actually be the weakest argument since you admitted in CX that the end impact of this contention is postponed time.

Make sure to sign-post - tell exactly which contention you're attacking/defending. I didn't catch your responses to the attacks on your 2nd contention and your framework. You also did not respond to the Disadv.

Lately attack on CP was that it doesn't test base knowledge. Need to do a much better job refuting our opponent's case.

First time weighing framework was in 2AR. Need to address in 1AR.

**RFD:** I'm weighing under Util because Aff did not refute Util until 2AR. Under both frameworks, Neg turned the issue of minorities and showed that standardized tests are necessary to combat grade inflation.