<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Armando Montero (’11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Scheller</td>
<td>Saif Agha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Basis Mesa</td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30) 29</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good case, not bad think you need a
  more confident delivery (gives him too many
  speeches)
- Need more offensive questions in CK, too
  many cold starts (gives him too many
  speeches)
- Spend most time directly - there were a lot
  of hard questions (was that time in the
  last thirty?)
- Need to push hour on the systematic
  vision
- Need to keep the same right to know

 Jedi: I vote Aff. It comes down to Autism contention. Do clear extend Fastest which claims:
 that it is the test itself, not timing, that excludes disabled bodies. Also clear extend now only
 compete really will solve (any or for atom fall flat) and any new solutions (motor and somatosensory
 sensation) so not now getting rid of test will make it worse.
BHATTACHARYA, ABIR

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

Varsity Lincoln Douglas  Abir Bhattacharya (*7)

Round 4  Room 2222  Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM

Affirmative  Points  (25-30)  Negative  Points  (25-30)
Calvin Tyler  30  29.0  Rhegan Crabtree  9 Brophy College Prep  11 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
1. Excellent speaking and logical reasoning skills
2. Suffices arguments with valid and qualitative reasons
3. Excellent X-questioning skills
4. Strong ability to synthesize information and present coherently

Neg
1. Excellent debate potential requires further
2. His wonderful X-questioning skills
3. Defends for last well, and has the ability to reinforce
   an argument
4. Can improve how she synthesizes information and
   summarizes often in final closing
Value: Justice, Efficiency
Knowledge is a perspective.
Group organizations and reduce structural discrimination.

1. Racial discrimination African Americans done by other Caucasians.
2. Does not assume predict success.
3. Grades are good and are better than standardized tests.

Provide more research findings to support conclusions.

Scores are associated with family and financial well-being.

Mental health detrimental and creates stress and adversely affects health.

Repeat refers to location and well-prepared and question on competence of students.

Scores for students with equally academic capabilities have lower grades in college.

Research that grades are better predictors of success than good argumentative skills.

Arms
Ask probing questions if judges do not follow the rule.

Good's universal.

Standardized tests predict college performance.

Scholarly work,
1. Not for range of college,
2. Helps develop analytical skills
3. Have been influential to help with times.
4. Not have standardized tests
5. Reflects grades
6. Provides some data points.
7. Access to quality curriculum instead of heavy standardized tests.
8. Remotely, interest can be learned.
9. It helps people from less well-off groups.
10. Need to have free or standardized tests for poor oral
11. Advocates for a combined

Colleges (CPA + 1973)

Not college SAT's degrade college recruitment.

Colleges take a holistic view of students to judge potential and admission realistic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Lyndsey Long (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raunak Deb</td>
<td>Tanisha Bhattacharya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **N**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tanisha was articulate and made compelling arguments using 1) utilitarianism, 2) objective criteria, 3) mitigating gaming by GPA and laboratory hours, and 4) greater transparency. Raunak's cross-examination was very effective.

Both students made a lot of good arguments without any proof. It is understood that there is not any evidence to support either argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Liam Huggins (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Lifshitz</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1AC: contentions 1 & 2 seem fairly topical, contention 3 does not.

1NC: Great logic, slow down on authors!!! I missed after on my flaw, let your case down.

2AR: Fantastic line-by-line track lining thin but impactful calls on the NC. Wish was more direct on NC point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Room 222**

**Points**

25/30

**Wayne Montes de Oca (21)**

**Points**

30/30

**FRI 10/04/19 07:30PM**

**Line Judge**

Amini

2: Arizona College Prep

**English Teacher**

OCA, WAYNE MONTES DE DESERT RIDGE MANDER INVITATIONAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Saul Grajales (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2218</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Ezri Tyler:**

Strong articulation, conviction and with facts.
First crossfire was well answered.

**Logan Kraver:**

Strong conviction, articulation, counter currents, answering crossfire questions... Needs more consistent delivery. First round was active, picked up in 2nd round.

Easily won, but just need that edge.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**CHOTALLA, MAANIK**

**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla ('9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2229</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **No**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Unsure how you value util and have a criterion of minimizing oppression
- Decent lar but really you just gotta lean on your Hampshire college evidence it is the strongest evidence in round

**ACF**

- your neg doesn't really have a great offensive impact, it's mostly just defense which doesn't make for a strong case
- The 2NA was a bit messy and jumped around a lot.
- Your argument really hinges on status quo empirics, give more evidence as if the aff is in place

**RFN:** I affirm on the Hampshire evidence. Neg just doesn't have very strong impacts and the aff at the very least has strong empirics as to what will happen with the res.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Justin Ruiz ('10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Try to trap well needed to be ready for the counters
| Amits test are flawed international
| Money
| Schools are
| The are Beifits (what are they?)
| Put in a defensive mode
| Gave Amnmo to be used
| Wants to reproof ES

(Race) Poor school = poor score
Has a good flow and del adding points and info well, has counters is leading and keeping the pursser on.

Teach to test
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Charina Tecson (‘4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

| Rio Pham               | 2 Arizona College Prep |
| 28                     |

**Negative**

| Ved Prashant Patil    | 5 BASIS Peoria        |
| 29                     |

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge’s Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**NEG**

- good response to t-shell
- always link to why judge should care

**AFF**

- attack links or group arg
- establish what ground because he said the argument is topical

**RFD**

- Neg won on t-shell response and CP
### VLD

**Varsity Lincoln Douglas** | **Chuck Schneider (‘12)**
---|---
**Round 4** | **Room 2227** | **Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM**
---|---|---
**Affirmative** | **Points (25-30)** | **Negative** | **Points (25-30)**
Ayush Kothari | 22 | Delaney Krieger | 26
4 Basis Mesa | | 2 Arizona College Prep | |
---|---|---|---
The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win? **Yes**

**Judge’s Signature:** GCA

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

---

**Affirmative:**
- No eye contact - read from computer
- Fast talker

- Crossfire - Good discussion

- Delaney - acres - Good about speaking + eye contact
- Good -

---

**Negative:**
- Quality vs. Accuracy. Std setting
- Not optimal

- Good aggression
- Presentations - outlined
- Very nicely

- Sold!

- Affirmative - not great!!

- Didn’t provide enough backup to support cause.
VLD

Varisty Lincoln Douglas | Spencer Kvit (*5)
---|---
Round 4 | Room 2224 | Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM

Affirmative | Points (25-30) | Negative | Points (25-30)
---|---|---|---
Stella Lovelady | 2 | Sohani Sandhu | 7
22 Tempe Preparatory Academy | | 2 Arizona College Prep |

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative | Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

BASIS Peoria

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Lots of time devoted to numbers, limited time on argumentation (at least in construction)
- Bring up util. when explaining why we should let false classes into college.
- I appreciate the skepticism toward the objectivity of the SAT.
- This turned out to be a benefit rather than a burden.
- Why not focus on the value of a college education in the first place? Seems like a serious oversight.
- More clarity on the meaning of "safety net".

Affirmative

- Your evaluation on equality was a bit vague.
- Is it really "equality"?
  - Given socioeconomic?
- You use equality to justify the moral necessity of equality.
- Good point on grade inflation.
- Why is a standardization of questions objective?
  - There is evidence to the contrary empirically.
- The point on subjectivity could use stronger evidence beyond the intuitive basis for their claim.
  - Presupposing that SAT is a preparedness test.

Affirmative provided significant doubt on the objectivity of the tests, which neg did not sufficiently rebut; this I award the win to AFF.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2228</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhenni Gao</td>
<td>Bennett David Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative \(\text{□}\) Negative \(\text{□}\)
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? \(\text{□} \)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good job in Debate - Nice Work of Research

Negative won - had proved that minorities hurt
by tests. Funding, grade inflation, objectivity all
flawed. Used AIDs, Value of did good job. Aff needs
to be clearer. Don't use acronyms. They can lose in
argument. Conclusion moved but inaccurate. Good debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Patrick Stone ('20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
<td>Carter Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30) 24</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Xavier Stone**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Dover State**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Aff* is the winner. They were able to keep the value of fitness and dignity flowing through. The *Aff* CP was a good counterpoint, but *Neg* was able to build from gaps and yet show issues with it that still supported the CP flow. Built off the act 3rd criteria (neg was good here); there was still none left on the *Aff*.