### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**VLD**

**FLIP:** 22 Stella Lovelady v. 20 Ezri Tyler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Armando Montero (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _No_

**Judge's Signature**

Desert Utha

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- There is not really an impact coming from your C1. Why does this matter below Unit 1?
- Know now you states you cite are done.
- You flow econ well. Tough, but don't really get exams tomorrow.
- You should have spent more time on the NC in extend quickly or spend more on the AC.
- General, I see talk on general topic, not admission rate = no access to econ impacts.
- You gave influence of view on Pincarski-Arrows.

---

_RFP:_ I vote neg. A lot of good on topic (meds and health care vs. social Security), who's the only offense comes off the floor (and ext 1/eco), but you still talk about generation costs in college, not admission rates. Soft active good extended when he in 50%. Has no offense left in the room. Cross room!
Call to Covertible or Soft Convertible Cards

Call to NIMM 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOTHAM, ELI</th>
<th>Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VLD</td>
<td>FLIP: 22 Stella Lovelady v. 20 Ezri Tyler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Eli Botham (*13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></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>Stella Lovelady</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ezri Tyler</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Net advantage to everyone w/ no not DA
Sign-posting was confusing in ZAR
Group arguments and cross-applications are the Negative Flow
Don't jump between flows and when responding to her responses on your case, say why?

where the argument response was on the AC for sympathy.

Just hide out of will and weigh underneath Neg FW. Or you can go for your FW prop, which I think you want. But, since FW debate was sort-of irrelevant, I didn't think it mattered.

An attempt to extend scholarship American and but I think it was dropped. You go for some sort of last minute props in the ZAR

that I think were already lost. You didn't really have much of an option here though, so that's ok.

Aff only addresses this in ZAR and might not have realized this.

CX: Not sure what or how the minorities playt
import to util question or works (responsive to what was
not). I didn't buy this framing sort of Q since
util cares about all members of society and minorities are
members. I think a separate definition of util or a
conceptual methodology of what util means
makes sense, though the concept doesn't seem applicable
here when the Aff.

Nice job sign-posting.

The analysis in the NC responding to the
Aff's imports wasn't done, though you were
set up for impeding out.

Nice job collapsing.

FW debate was a wash. Both debates are talking about is to minorities. Also, util doesn't say anything about not valuing
minorities. Sure, policy makers don't look to minorities but that doesn't mean util doesn't care about all members
of society. Plus, since no DA or either way (since it is a
more minority argu, FW debate was irrelevant, I thought.)

The way that I interpret the Neg is as a clouded

CP, which is a little smart since Aff isn't really responding
to the cards. Neg gets a lot of ground in its generally
related to predictive validity (include validity)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong> Points</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong> Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stella Lovelady *29*   | Ezri Tyler *30*      |

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

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Unsure what your big util impacts are
- You gotta be way more word efficient in this IA
- you conceded a lot or the neg in the IA it gives a huge out for the neg to just extend and blow up their contentions.

**Ney**

- To clarify the minority impacts on the aff are still util impacts they're just small impacts
- Man, killer cross-x
- Good NC/NR, uncovered C2 a little but overall good
- Make more specific responses to the IA responses as well as your extensions
- You're getting repetitive in your 2NR, make more ways

RFD: I negate on the grade inflation impact of it being worse for minorities to take away the 5&7. Aff just undercover the neg which lets the neg blow it up in the 2NR thus I negate.
Aff- Aff did an excellent job during first cross-x with giving direct answers efficiently and without having to think about it. This shows me that he has really studied the topic and is passionate about his research. There was a slight lapse in his cross-x of neg but did well in his rebuttal of the Neg’s case. While the aff had a better presentation of their case, I don’t believe the Aff’s case was as strong and persuasive.

Neg- Neg has a very informal way of presenting certain pieces of information as shown during the cross-x of the Neg. Neg did have a strong case toward keeping standardized tests in place. Neg had better evidence toward the penalties of getting rid of these tests that showed more hardship towards under privileged children. Neg, while informal at times, presented well and showed real passion for his research and had great evidence to support his case and negate the Aff.

Decision- My decision is truly based on the case evidence and information given in the round by the Neg. I felt that his case was more in line with the reality of the real issues regarding college admissions.

Neg wins Debate!
Aff 6
X 3
Neg 7
Aff 
Neg Rebuttal 4
Neg 6 Aff Rebuttal
Close
Aff Neg Close 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Wayne Montes de Oca ('21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2232</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Jones 28</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler 25</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 rate, volume, use of gestures, good evidence usage, eye contact. Good, very focused and deliberate, passionate and convincing. Great summary of evidence and reasoning for position. Good energy and enthusiasm.

Good pace, questions, clarification. Looked down at his computer screen? Confident and specific. Provides a good summary of evidence. Good. Approach very 'plain'.

Judge's Signature: Jennifer High, English Teacher
John Browder 201
NGUYEN, KHOA

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

VLD
FLIP: 6 Zachary Jones v. 9 Calvin Tyler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM</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>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Zach's cross-examination of Capt as predictive or not was well-done. I would like to have seen him go further and develop it more.

- Calvin's cross-examination included good questions regarding "turns of phrase" and he nicely incorporated the answer into Negative case.

- Calvin's argument that "tests are predictive of success, who cares if schools teach it, it is a good argument. I didn't catch a compelling rebuttal. The Aff on this topic has an obstacle if it can't undermine claim that tests are predictive of success. Zach relied on the "re-regulation of curriculum" argument, but to me at least, it couldn't beat back the argument of "tests are predictive of success."

I would recommend thinking about that issue to come up with more to rebut it. That's the argument that carried the round for the Negative.