<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATIL, PRASHANT</th>
<th>Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Prashant Patil (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sydney Scheller         | Stella Lovelady     |
| 4 Basis Mesa            | 22 Tempe Preparatory Academy |
| **Points (25-30)**: 28  | **Points (25-30)**: 29 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Affirmative**
  - Opening argument was good covering reason & examples.
  - Good cross examination and asked persistent questions and trying to get answers until you had the answer you may be trying to reach.
  - Summary was well organized and presented in a nice way.
  - Could have had advantage if shown more consistency in deep diving into some questions.

- **Negative**
  - Neg put forward information that also tried to provide a resolution to the problem, rather than just trying to support neg case, which is a positive point.
  - Neg counter argument points to the specific facts and examples of how any solution will not work well organized and nicely presented.
  - Summary was well presented and included the format within the framework.
**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Is this a low point win?

**Epistemology:**

- The winner of this debate was...

**Judge's Signature:**

- 15 Mountain View High School
- School Affiliation: Southwestern

**Points:**

- 25-30

---

**VLD**

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Round 3**

- Varsity Lincoln Douglas
- Affirmative: Ved Prashant Patil
  - 5 BASIS Peoria
  - Points: 25/30
  - Room: 2232
  - Fri, 10/4/19 6:00 PM
- Negative: Neel Chakrera ('16)
  - Points: 15

---

**Affirmative:**

- **Positive**
  - Strong connection to 9/11.
  - Good argument about training to speak.

---

**Negative:**

- **Negative**
  - Weak argument about training to speak.
  - Weak connection to 9/11.

---

**Jury:**

- Pratik Shah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Christine Theile (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2219</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mia Lupica</td>
<td>Parsa Amini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value of utilitarianism ran from neg side was affirmed by Aff - "no harm" but not rebutted by Neg. Racism from AFF was rebutted by neg and neg flow was consistent that it's not just tests but system that's racist. AFF contention of curriculum narrowing stands. Neg did not provide sufficient evidence to stop.

Both were well organized, well spoken, well researched. Great job by both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Anmarie Stone (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thank you for providing verbal guideposts to your presentation. You did a good job trying to refute each point. I think Neg ended up putting you on the defensive, but you rallied and made your original contentions stick.

Thank you for asking about "Fog-Tolland" (?) Test. I had no clue what exactly that was until you asked Neg to explain.

You are a very good speaker, you keep a good flow going. Obviously you were very very prepared and you had LOTS of information. I felt like you had so much that you didn't really get into any of the arguments with any depth. And presenting 20 things + expecting Aff to address ALL of them is too much. They don't "flow through" because it was just a single barrage of info. There's only a few minutes, pick fewer points and develop them more.

Aff wins mostly because your arguments were more developed and supported. I still don't understand the Structural Violence thing but I understood less from the other side. This is hard! Good job both of you!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOTHAM, ELI</th>
<th>Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</td>
<td>Eli Botham (*'13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2224</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegan Crabtree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

McClintock HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Like your case A LOT. Good case.
- The teacher aspect of your case is interesting.
- Finland response that it was *not* sufficient to A very weak analysis reason why Finland fails to prove. I'd just drop this.
- Having trouble following some early IAR and ZAR args on sympathy.
- I think that you probably made good arguments but I did not understand them when there was jumping around on the flow. Don't get too flustered. Impose organization!
- I think it would have helped me follow your arguments better. Remember that your judge hasn't read all of the lit on a particular topic and so might not follow lightening fast jumps and responses w/ particular cards... native to the topic sign posting.

Happens to be "pretty racist" - that is hilarious.

I'd like a little bit more clarity on the CP.

Finland being a small country? Not sure how this works in proving not generalizable.

If I think it might, I'm just not seeing this particular warrant.

Good inflection of your voice @ key points! (Such as "\( \sum \)") Us "happens to be pretty racist." - kind of humorous too. I like!

Didn't fully understand predictive analytics are.

Nice job w/ clarifying the args that you were talking about eg. DA1, DA2,... CP and then methodologically using your analysis for the other Neg args to cross apply on Att. This made it very "EASY" for me to follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Cheryl Buyama (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2228</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saif Agha</td>
<td>Dylan Lifshitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</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:

Saif had more contentions which required more rebuttal answers which perhaps were not fully addressed.

But Dylan was very logical & easy to follow.

Both value definitions were over my head but both speakers did a good job of explaining what it meant.

Both were also very well spoken and persuasive in their contentions & rebuttals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Aniruddha Deb (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanisha Bhattacharya</td>
<td>Zhenni Gao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (25-30) 9 6

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall okay presentation. I found that the value of justice is not well established within the evidences. Such as the case of just because standardized test may help the majority, so minorities case can be neglected. This argument is questionable.

However, good effort on counter partly the opponents.


Needs to excel in condense prompt, restate and ability to identify opponents weak points & ability to nullify them.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Patrick Stone (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2218</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong> Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong> Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohani Sandhu 2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>Adyant Mishra 5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Circle Winner)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff did well on building case-striking alignment of criteria to value to framework.

A little shaky on 2nd rebuttal, but did well on recovery voters-thought their contention would flow as their sole/un best reply value.

Good job on cross and well prepared.

Neg was disrespectful to opponents and judge. Was set-up and trying down during prep. Intentionally dug self alone in cross was rude. Did not use two many arguments up front.

Did well building against off case by strong pts would not solve for resolution.

Rebuttal was a bit off and would not define Fw and Vw had to follow.

Aff was winning as they were able to go back to their framework and value and show it best supported resolve.

Neg had some valid content but their take downs didn't pull enough out of case. Neg also didn't produce any evidence to back claims.
Varsity Lincoln Douglas | Bita Taji (*2)
---|---
Round 3 | Room 2227 | Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM
---|---|---
**Affirmative** | **Negative**
Sara Korpe 5 BASIS Peoria | Ezri Tyler 20 Sunnyslope High School
Points (25-30) | Points (25-30)
28 | 29
---|---
The winner of this debate was
**Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win? **NO**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**
Able to respond quickly to questions. Knows how to drive points home and defends them with evidence. Good attack on Neg's points.

**Neg**
Strong points made. Clear and eloquent language. Strong argument. This was a difficult to decide on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2220</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Miller</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg turned the 1AC - Systemic Bias - GPA inflator in 2NC

Neg evidence invalidated Aff evidence - school test case

Aff solvency was lacking - Aff did not show that minority SAT/ACT would solve for systemic bias in college admissions

For these reasons Neg is the winner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Debbie Schneider (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
<td>Rio Pham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Aft
- Equality
- Bad test facts
- Manipulability
- No value of that
- Chain racial minorities
  1. Socioeconomics
  2. Manip
  3. Bias

Neg stated things that affirmed Aft. i.e. racism + socioeconomics standing.

- Ethics
- Subjectivity
  - Whenever stand test.

  - How to choose students
  - See who is prepared, valid & reliable.
  1. Racism
  2. Neutrality

  - World experience math?
  - Tests combat racism.
  - Take tests away can lead to racism.
AFT
6 min 20
3 min quest.
net
## VLD

**Varsity Lincoln Douglas** | **Greg Pratt ("13")**
---|---
**Round 3** | **Room 2222** | **Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaney Krieger</td>
<td>Raunak Deb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30) 20</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **McClatchie / Retired**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**APP:** Excellent response in CX, outstanding question formation anticipation your plan attack. Both offense & defense in the round were well developed. You should anticipate stronger framework analysis attack (what?) in future rounds. Thank you for adjusting to my speed limit.

**NEG:** Try for more presented in CX - this will improve as you develop flow skills. You should have clarified extended both conditional causation solvency arguments - both were more assertions within 2nd Neg and fell to previous AFF analysis.

**BALLOT:** Straightforward round - Neg conceded framework so ballot went to AFF which prevailed on issue of VR racism and equality. 2 very talented, prepared varsity debaters
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CX</th>
<th>vaste</th>
<th>understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Have selected resources
2. Need to access
3. Need for access

---

1. Grades better than
2. Soft scores
3. Admissions

---

1. SAT
2. ACT
3. AP

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>English = 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</td>
<td>Muzaffar Khan (*2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett David Fees</td>
<td>Lucas Grajales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</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:

- Good presentation, gestures, and eye contact.
- Could have slowed down to be clearer on some words.

**Cross**
- Cross questioning was good but jumped when could not support the follow-up question.
- At one point, you were supporting your opponent's position.
- Made a good case for your side, could have used a bit more data to support

- Good questions asked, should have had a follow-up question to negate.
- Good pace and clearly spoken and understood.
- Made a good case with examples.
- Made a good defense of the position.
- Confident in presenting and supporting his side.

Both sides have very good case and presentation. Judging call all from presentation, personal interaction and clear communication and data was the deciding factor.