Your frame work wasn't very convincing, gave me reasons why poetry is good but not why I should value it over Neg Fa in 1AR & 2AR.

Good job pointing out the ambiguity in tuition hikes from Hampshire.

- Good job giving voters at the end, I wish you had cross applied those args to the 1AR.
- Should have weighed the shift arg against her critique of test

RFD: I had to judge under the negative framework but couldn't vote for the negative because there was no response to the biases and inaccuracies in standardized testing that all brought up in 1AR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>John Doller (**)</th>
<th>Brandon Favre (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>Room 603</td>
<td>Sat 10/26/19 01:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Savannah Elizabeth McNamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Horizon High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RPD: May '91 is uncontested & outweighs Lash '15. This demonstrates better predictability. Rovhianich '19 turn & this consideration is key. Buckley's answers Carnevale, + grade inflation.

However, Dutton '90 is extended, along w/ instructors to drop the neg for reading Baudrillard! Also, off is also working in hypered Dutton.
**FLIP: 4 Nivea Mahesh Krishnan v. 11 Zachary Jones**

**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Room 601</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 01:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nivea Krishnan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- You need to bring specific evidence for implementing CRAs.
- I need more clear extensions off the AC. There were plenty & dropped over WO could have been won.
- Extend PC. Goes on violence: 3 strikes violence.
- There needs to be a better explanation of CRAs coming out & the AC.
- That JAR was really messy.
- Just run this as a CP?
- 4) You can't claim so 99 then say I'm not admitting.
- You are making too many new cops in the JAR.
- I think you focus on the wrong axes - we did give several concessions.
- Make sure to hit support E, that hurt you most bad.
- Even if its just cross-examining you understand here.

---

**RFs:** I wrote afo. Aff clearly shows warrants is why sets an inherently oppressive (fair test and weapon) which takes out CP's only offense. With the CP tricked and cancelled warrants of how CRAs solve, I can win on affi risks and solutions.
A
Walnut

N
Show 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Simol Shah (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>Room 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajin Agha (27)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajin Nimesh (4)</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:

**AFF**
- Good pace. Remember to clearly define your cards (i.e. great as a matter, so judge can keep up on flow)
- The round got a little heated, don’t go under your breath because it can look side toward opponent.

**Neg**
- Good pace. When listing of saying “first” a little more loudly/forcefully will get the judge to pay attention
- Keep off your phone (can be eliminated)

**RFD**
Negative won on flow with card extensions, properly responded to turn and listed why it impacted and helped more people (spec. min)
### VLD

**FLIP: 4 Claire Mae Mullings v. 2 Ben Brady**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Naveed Mohammad (*'36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 604</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mullings</td>
<td>Ben Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- I think that this is a very interesting, compelling, and strategic case!
- Good CX questions; way to set them up
- Work on extensions & impacting blc that felt a bit sloppy but you did a good job of interacting w/ the "wholistic" arg
- I wish you had gone w/ the identity & minorities arg more throughout the round

---

**RFD:** I vote AFF based off of the active learning and identity arguments. Since the AFF was able to prove the inherent harms coming from stan. tests, I had to vote for them because there was very little offense coming from the NEG. Both debaters had good clash on the contention level but need to work on impact calc and voters.
**VLD**

**FLIP: 27 Saif Agha v. 4 Ria Umesh Manathkar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Kathleen Clark (*'31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 611</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><strong>SAIF AGHA</strong></td>
<td><strong>RIA UMESH MANATHKAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **MORALITY / KNOWLEDGE**
- **SOCIETY / STRUCTURE** - Good cases
- **MINIMIZATION**
- **PRESENT BIAS** - ex. Asian American (Barber)
- ex.標準化 TESTS Ought Prevent Success
- **VERY CLEAR / CONVINCING**
- **GRATIS vs. SAT SCORES**
- **CLASS / SAT COHORT w/ WEALTH** (Society)
- **ASIAN PEOPLE / HIGH SCORES**
- **Mental Health / High Stress / Physical Illness

CROSS - How did you get this information (?a)?
- Why is this true?
- Why 44% in the class room? No? Proof?
- Why 50% of test scores?
- GREAT CROSS / GREAT COUNTERS / QUALITY.

- **SUBJECTIVE / ATTITUDE**
- Present / Absent
- Now Pervasive - Good Case
- EQUITY / Grade Inflation/Policy Fix?
- **OBJECTIVE TEST / Equally Rigorous**
- **PRESENTATION** - Class / Low Grade Students.
- **PREVAILING THE PRIMARY IDEA**
- REPEAT TESTING / PRIVATE COLLEGE.
- **Monash College**
- Monash University
- Social Economic Class / Low Income / IQ Tests.
- Structure in each realm (Harvard colleges).

- **Equalizing Planning Rebalancing Applicants (Reed without)**
- Not responsive / Site.
- **SIERRA LINK**
- **TECHNOLOGICAL APPROACH / Cross Inference**
- **MINIMIZES TESTING**
- Repeat Testing
- Accessibility / Minimums are Better.
- BETTER PRECINCTS / Better College Rate.
- FREE TESTING / Mental Health (One time only).

**Good Reasoning & Masters Work**

- **GREAT COME BACKS TO LAST 460 SWEAT.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH MCNAMARA 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEN PHILLIPS 26</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:

**AFF:** Good clear delivery of ideas, especially augmentation that standardized tests are not the end all for college admission or how that person will turn out.

**NEG:** Clear presentation, but some arguments did not validate your case, in my opinion.

Great debate!
VLD

FLIP: 27 Calvin Tyler v. 4 Abhigyan Kumar Shukla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Mike Brady (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 607</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>Calvin Tyler</td>
<td>Abhigyan Kumar Shukla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  
No

Judge's Signature

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - value & contentions clear  
Justice  

Aff - good state & facts except #4 was more anecdotal  
which neg hit & well. Stats about predictors but not cu.

Cx1 - Neg asked to quantify #4 which aff could not  
- 2nd question about clarify if not tests then what (answer grades) was a bit of a waste as already stated

Cx2 - why can't colleges deal with grade inflation, they can see it? Excellent question.  
States pass laws each one of them? Good ques
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Neg Sound & clear primary content...
**FLIP: 32 Advant Mishra v. 11 Zachary Jones**

**VLD**

**Varsity LD Debate**

**Nik Pearce ('22)**

**Octo-Finals**

**Room 603**

**Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Advant Mishra** 28

**Negative**

- **Zachary Jones** 29.5

---

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

- **Negative**

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

---

**Judge’s Signature**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

> "Good cross-x"

> "Wolf is is a trashbag"

> "U till isn’t a value"

> "Give me a reason to vote for your VC"

> "I really like the GPA solvency cont"

> "You should perm the alt"

> "Tell me why the equality matters more than the inherent violence"

---

KVP's

RdB I meet

Rn Lnk n t

2.13

---
## VLD

**FLIP: 27 Bennett David Fees v. 16 Tran Thien Nguyen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Lindsey Long ('19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 609</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Nguyen</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Fees</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **N**

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

Judge's Signature: **DSF**

Horizon High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **HOW**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tran: include evidence about SAT/ACT is biased

Email if you all have questions: danny.seep@gmail.com

RFD

Neg did good job proving that the aff world doesn't achieve diversity. Bennett made good case turns.