Affirmative: Good preparation and excellent systematic response to neg arguments. Effective linkage from utilitarian to economics to need for engineers and scientists. One key question is whether standardized tests actually are more useful if taken repeatedly. Your evidence showed tests measured test-taking ability but as neg pointed out if test were made free so that disadvantaged students had equal opportunity standardized tests would better measure knowledge/mathematical ability.

Negative: One of the biggest issues with your argument is that this could be done with the rich to fund better education. However, regardless standardized testing. However, the strength of your argument that a more diverse and egalitarian admission process through testing was won the argument.
VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Derek Clifford (*7)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 207</strong></td>
<td><strong>(25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Cougar Phillips</td>
<td>Ria Umesh Manathkar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>McClintock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School / Affiliation / Occupation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great Round! You are both strong debaters! You both make great arguments, now time to go the extra step of telling your judge exactly how the argument impacts the round (examples, how does your turn gain you offense or prohibit them from offense? Does it break their link chain or any other impact in the round?)

I ended up voting off on the argument that "objective measuring" with test scores is inherently racist because of who the test is designed for and by. Free testing doesn't necessarily eliminate barriers like vocabulary used in low income communities. Aff minimized more oppression
## Comments & Reason for Decision:

My value is justice (both scored) with a big definition (no dash) and my criterion is equity and utilitarianism (depending on the definition of justice—both criteria win out).

**PRO**

- C1: failed non unique
- C2: overly diverge
- C3: holds but weaker
  - didn't respond
  - (a bit unfair)

**NEG**

- C1: fails
- C2: goes college
- C3: holds but worse

Neg agreed any care wins and this wasn't attacked so it was possible to decide based on merely allowing OEDFL scenes to be allowed.
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirm:
1. Good argument regarding S-T as an indicator of graduation rate is low income population.
2. The additional resources needed to be successful in S-T that only by high income population have available.
3. Need a better rebuttal with more fluid arguments rather to the original framework and value.

Neg:
1. Good overall presentation with strong cross examination questions.
2. Very good closing arguments with good view why S-T elimination did not change the present rate of college admission and graduation.
3. Please include the real problem associated with lack of resources or money in public schools.
**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**N**: You did very well to follow my paradigms. That significantly made it easier to follow along. The arguments made were well supported while mentioning which points you were rebutting. This made it easy to be reminded as to how the points being made were related to each other.

**A**: You did pretty well to follow my paradigms. There were occasions of switching back and forth between off and neg without sign posting. This made it more difficult to follow along with the argument. There were times where you could have used your time better. But that aside, both of you did not post that you were switching to the sides case. When you were done supporting your argument, neither of you posted to me that you were now switching to your opponent's case.

**RFD**: The neg side provided and supported his case in a more organized fashion, the neg was able to tackle more of the points made by the aff. In addition, made it more easier to see how which points the aff were supported or not. The aff tried to support his argument during the round, but his attempt to further support his argument didn't really support his argument.
VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Maaanik Chotalla (*27,32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 211</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>Mariah Hays</td>
<td>Malachi Mendel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Affirmative
- Negative

(Circle Winner)

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

Rosenberger

Judge's Signature

RVHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Mea's lack of organization, connecting ideas to create a narrative of refutation hurt his case. The judge should not make the connection for the debaters.

I enjoyed Mea's position, would have bought it if it were connected to the ATT by the debater. ATT's case was well developed — permed — they did not answer; well didn't answer more of ATT case.

... I vote ATT

Very enjoyable debate!
DELGADO, DANIELLE

VLD

Varsity LD Debate
Danielle Delgado (*31,19)

Round 2
Room 304
Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM

Affirmative
Ben Brady
2 Horizon Honors High School

Points
(25-30)

Negative
Meghan Kiley Munoz
33 Desert Ridge High School

Points
(25-30)

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative
Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ☑

Judge's Signature

Perry High debate

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Standardized testing
- VQA: "equality of opportunity"
- The Neg: Asian Cultural Argument is stereotyping a race with generalization
- The equality of opportunity is actually aligned with the intent of the res.
- I still have more to say
- I cannot vote
- Ben estimates the underprivileged
- College is not mandatory
- College is not necessary
- I voted affirmative

The Neg: American cultural argument is stereotyping a race with generalization which cancels me personally.

The equality of opportunity is aligned with the intent of the res.

The Aff: I cannot vote for an amendment of the resolution that is not topical. The framers intent of the res is preserved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 212</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Maya Conroy  
16 Mountain View High School | Nivea Mahesh Krishnan  
4 Hamilton 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:

Need an explanation why SATS: key to school systems disparities

I think the Neg is ahead on this question of solvency - I'm not sure how the act restructures schooling to give marginalized folk an opportunity. The wealth of schools (which seems like the root cause of these issues is unchanged). Aff needs a better answer to this subjectiveness arc.

Think this is a good strat, just stress the non-ugliness of the act (they should've been able to discuss methodology).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Aatmik Mallya (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Eckstein</td>
<td>Pratik Shah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Chandler High School</td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 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:

kritik flows through (barely) because 2NR link/impact arguments were conceded.

verbal RFD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Jim Fountain Classic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity LD Debate</td>
<td>Raasana Donadio (*33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajni Nimesh Patel</td>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: *Raasana Donadio*

School / Affiliation / Occupation: *Desert Ridge High*

---

**Aff**

- Based on the outline of 1st speech, clear points made, great response to round 2 questions from Neg.
- Good supporting details on facts for each contention.
- Spoke clearly and flowed speech.
- Was able to bring up Neg. points in follow up 2nd & 3rd speeches. Outlined clear points to show change in stance for the Neg. argument.
- Restated why AFF case was the way to vote to go back to original contentions.

**Nego**

- Spoke clear on line of questions. Was able to have some room for uncertainty in 1st line of questioning to the AFF.
- Gave a counterplan and supporting facts.
- Lts advantages pointed to why AFF contention may be called into question of testing bias.
- Overall, gave a great speech to why case of the Neg should win.
The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"In the United States, standardized testing should not be considered when deciding for college admission.

1. Colleges and universities
   - Disproportionate advantages
   - Structural violence
   - Disenfranchised advantages
   - Modern day context?
   - Black/whites

2. Billion dollar industry
   - For the wealthy
   - 16,000? cuttoff number?
   - What is PSAT? Explain.
   - Test prep colleges
   - Wealth = Higher college test scores

5:45

1:34 prep"
Not entirely convinced white, wealthy (explains)

- N-
  Structural interacts
take during school years
  ACT / SAT parties (indicators of future success)
  GPA's inflated
  Help underprivileged
  (more objective
  missing deadline)

1) Grade inflation
  High score reforms place higher in grade inflation
  Good for ongoing schools
  Impartial
  Public & private for
  objective metric

vaccines
 ultural measurement
  B. Academic opportunities
  Structural violence

AR
  Studying unfair advantage
  Includ
  Capitalist approach - industrialist
  Study schools ability to teach
  Critical thinking skills are part of life skills

Both - A/ N -
  Watch basic speech mechanics - not doing "uh"
  Needs research um"

- N -
  Mandated free practice sessions
  Equity - access to education
  Cheating is not demographic
  Grade inflation

Scholarships?
  Minorities hardships
  Look at context of
  ACT/SAT - Lack
  Standardized testing
  Everyone is taught the
  Some subjects. Not true -
  Test itself is faulty.
**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 301</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsa Amini</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bennett David Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - Good point about test construction
  - Good points about other types of questions can illustrate better life experiences than standardized test questions to make billion decisions about admissions.

- **Negative:**
  - More believable cross on discerning mental health
  - Good cross on sort modification, to reflect racism argument of pain test format.
  - Shifts admission to more subjective criteria.
  - Combat model migration.
  - Eliminating testing score and unrelated racism.

---

**Note:**

- Should not use SAT scores in college admissions.
- Should use SAT scores.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Tim Parra (*'36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Round 2<br>Room 201<br>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Peters 34 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>Zachary Jones 11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**<br>**Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Meg was extremely convincing and used gestures to emphasize his argument. Very Persuasive.
- Good use of references.
- Great defense in cross, do not concede when opponent is correct?
- Good responses to cross, used cross to clarify Meg positions.
- Lost momentum, when challenged by neg.
- Rate of Speech too fast at times (pause) causing "verbal out.
- Great summary.

Very convincing and driven, seemed to lose momentum when his challenge was continued.

Great passion for argument, Very Convincing.

Quickly water during debate - detracts from argument.

Very knowledgeable of references.

- Too fast causing mis-spoken words.
- Test optimal, good argument, Very Persuasive!
Don't care until as a value w/m function give justice or morality

Your case is very redundant, many cover say the same thing
L you need to diversify your impacts

- ask more offensive questions in cr

- you need to extend specific case

Both don't weigh enough.

- You should attack more than the unit

Both speeches are very messy

- Your value offense under the V.C. - How you achieve your value
- You miss the link - "bitter colleges" is why you can rep on whiteness. [REVIEW]

Both Affirmative & Negative

- Good cr questions
- Don't look @ each other
- Your link needs to be clearer - you don't really explain it.

Almost on now tests hurt HBCAs

- You need to attack & take over

(about just cross your the k)

- You need a clear rob

- Your folders are opposite not until specific

- You need to extend way more (were is the key org?)

- There is no clear alt... or rob...

VFD: I vote neg. The round was messy with very little evidence offense on both sides. But neg loses the D which was not thrilled by the aff (many reframe until) and case turns flows under the VC. Aff doesn't extend sufficient offense.
- ReB?
- SMD to DC?
- bulk Q C

Aff

lash 15
VLD

Varsity LD Debate

Ram Vaidyanathan (*'11)

Round 2

Room 106

Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM

Affirmative

Zhenni Gao
22 Arizona College Prep

25

Negative

Savannah Elizabeth McNamara
9 Horizon High School

29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

Negative

(Circle Winner)

No

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1) Started off with a solid footing & framework, finished a little early.

2) Simply going to defend his key argument.

3) Started defending her own case with better clarity on rebuttal, unable to come with elegant thoughts, finished early again.

4) Again defending rather than rebutting.

Clear thoughts & set the ground rules. Clear, very persuasive.

Owning the argument very thoroughly & very well structured.

Key voting topics addressed!

Set a clear note on Aff's case focusing on elite schools. Focus on core problem rather than close gap sources.

Very well organized flow of information.

Overall, great flow of information & clear thoughts.
Both debaters made strong args., but Calvin's evidence about SAT/ACT being racially biased won the round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Nick Miller (*'32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Morgan Applegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) \( \text{No} \)

Is this a low point win? \( \text{No} \)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both sides put forth a clear argument, but Morgan did not refute Claire's points. She states that testing is one part of the application process, but does not state that testing itself strips identity from a person.
- The other major factor was the link of higher scores to more success in college. This may be true, but if the test process is not equal, it doesn't hold.
- Digging more into other studies would have helped (both sides).
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Charyse Betts (<em>5</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Rio Pham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Cheeti</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was:</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Chery M. Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>Willow Canyon Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Jay had clear points and support. He had eye contact, and weaved in/out of reasoning wonderfully.
- Rid wasn’t clear in delivery, and at times, contradicted himself. During cross, he couldn’t establish his claim or provide credibility.
- Overall, Jay had examples, research, and solvency.
AFF 2ND REBUTtal

- MAY NOT BE A GOOD TEST TAKER, BUT COULD STILL GET IN

- HOLISTIC OVERVIEW (IS NOT RACIST)

- CLAIMING THAT CLUBS/TEACHERS ARENT RACIST

- CLAIMING TO SAVE PEOPLE

CROSS EX

EQUAL OPP, $6 - TUTOR $1116
SOLVENCY $6
SOLVENCY $1116
SOLVENCY $6
ALLEVIATE DEBT $6
TEST AMOUNT

NEG -> NO CLAIM
NEG CONSTRUCT

CROSS EX

AFF -> HARVARD
1000 vs. 1200 EXPLANATION

VERY CONVOLVLED STILL CROWN UNDERSTAND NEG ARGUMENT FULLY

NEG LUNывать INEQUITY UNCLAR

AFF 1ST REBUTtal

- PUSH AWAY MINORITY TO SUPPORT MAJORITY

- SAT SCORES CAN GET A LOW SAT AND BE IN

- INCOME DISPARITY

1. NON-TYPICAL RESPONSE
2. SAYS EYES MANAGE WORKLOAD

CROSS EX

EQUAL OPP, $6 - TUTOR $1116
SOLVENCY $6
SOLVENCY $1116
SOLVENCY $6
ALLEVIATE DEBT $6
TEST AMOUNT

NEG -> NO CLAIM
NEG CONSTRUCT

ONLY SPEWING STATS, NO SUPPORT, WHERE ARE YOUR THOUGHTS?

- INEQUALITY WILL GROW

- UNFAIR/BIAS

- JUSTICE FOR ALL STUDENTS

CHECK APP @ FASTER RATE

- REDUCE WORKLOAD FOR ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

HE IS MAKING CLAIM THAT OPPONENT WAS SAYING YOU CAN GET RICH OTHER WAYS

- NO STRESS

- BUT LESS STRESS IS A GOOD START COULD NOT GET U

- CLARITY

NEG REBUTtal

- MAKING THE ARGUMENT THAT COLLEGE AREN'T LOOKING @ WHO YOU ARE

- GRADE INFLATION

- CONTRADICTORY ?? OPPONENT CASE IMPACT CASE

- WANTS MINORITY STUDENTS TO TAKE SAT, NO MONEY THC ? ??

- THIS STILL CHANGES ABILITY TO GO TO COLLEGE

- CLAIMING THAT CURBS/TEACHERS ARENT RACIST

- CLAIMING TO SAVE PEOPLE