**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 122</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</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>Valerie Peters</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Abhigyan Kumar Shukla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</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:**

Great read, easy to understand and speed wise. I would vote Affirmative directly argue her value ad criteria when you see her case instead of having me make connections.

Great ZNR! I especially like the weighing ad explaining of critical points - great clash.

Criteria wash - structural violence or helping disadvantaged, neither clear enough so I will use both and based decision on key areas.

AFF says test inherently biased ad Wealthy have adv. Neg says get rid of tests ad. Good ad curricular are even higher consideration. Thus oppressor more. This turn was captivating ad the "more time doesn't mean less objective" argument always in helping disadvantaged ad structural violence. Just edges out barely.

AFF - don't drop gender arg. Neg dropped ad that was good, but you dropped also.
# VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malachi Mendel</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ben Cougar Phillips</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</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**: Works here no meaning, can't have discussion. Did not talk on topic. Used Theory to state syllogism. No value content. Used research. boarded, did not debate on topic.

**Neg**: Had good definition of debate & being on topic. First speech too mild. Used a strong case. Should have more time on own contentions. Should have more time on own case. Violated form of debate was large. Was not time on this. Why not on own case?

The debate was not on topic & about the resolution both are strong debaters & talented. Even though it was on topic, after Neg speech wish Affirmative conceded a game & did not do last 3 minute speech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 201</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Eckstein</td>
<td>36 Chandler High School</td>
<td>Saif Agha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't reanalyze in rebuttal, do that later. Now move to your case.
- Use the non-native as to justify a perm.
- Don't ask references questions in rebuttals.
- You need to extend individual cases.
- You spend waaaay too much time on the Ac.
- White ppl don't care how long they colorized it or continue to.
- Use POSTAL - with now weak hit (inf) one you could easily win on a perm with the subpointation of it.
- Spend much more time on the Ac since the earliest times are the Ac.
- Rebuttal's an alert mess - make sur to sign post.

RFD: I made reg. links, impact, AltC and PoI's our flow through on the Ac. No offense coming to the Aff, case turns go unchecked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Sarah Carns (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 202</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Cheeti</td>
<td>Maya Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</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>Yasmeen Caro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? <em>NO</em></td>
<td>Basis Phx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Great cross-examination questions. Great constructive speech and taking into account opponents' contentions. Great counter on specifying the 32 billion goes to Title I schools and the funding going to test prep and classes for SAT/ACT and the fact Aff can perm.

I was confused by the statistic in your final summary.
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Maaaanik Chotalla (*27,32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Kan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sohani Sandhu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge’s Signature

Brophy / Coach / Evil

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- You really did not have to read either shell tbh
- Good extensions / coverage

**Neg**

- Try to engage more with the aff link chain / impact scenario
- Your 2NR was very repetitive, you need to offer different arguments to diversify
- You gotta also at least respond to the theory shells

RND: I affirm on the advantage / which is essentially dropped, I don't vote on theory because I don't want to.
WEAVER, TRACY

VLD

Varsity LD Debate	Tracy Weaver (*'19)

Round 3	Room 212	Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM

Affirmative	Negative
Stella Lovelady
31 Tempe Preparatory Academy

Points (25-30) 27

Sajni Nimesh Patel
Hamilton High School

Points (25-30) 29

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:
At times your words were slurred. Work on articulation—hard to hear a couple of your author names.

Work on CX answering & asking— a bit hesitant at times.

Because the IAF is only 4 minutes it is wise to do framework. Not then Attack all Neg.

Argument for util is hard to grasp.
Key voters were muddled a bit—too many cards—state arguments.

Both did a good job w/key topics.

Aff. contradicted self with a couple things. Neg had better

Solvancy.

GPA inflation also key. Attacks better on neg.

Jim Fountain Classic

Aff

Neg

Judge’s Signature 19

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Judge's Notes:

Not cool that your friend leaves during rebuttal. It coming to watch should strong.

Solid use of time, extending own case and also attacking AFF case.

Having tests but sending them optimal is somewhat of a concern for me.

Minority argument was won in neg didn’t truly understand AFF’s argument there.

Did not hear you explain your intern. 4 min Sinhalese Vihara. Where does this play into case?

Don’t time your opponent out loud—Rude.

Not a time your opponent out loud—Rude.

Motivated to hear you—Where does this play into case?
# VLD

**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 308</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
<td>Morgan Applegate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</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:**

- A value or humanizing qualifies as human or machine.
- Traditional test scores don't consider or standards.
- Value-own words and surveillance. Students voluntarily taking tests to bias STEM?
- Thank you for defining objective or equal. Testing conditions equal
test for different standards.
- Justice inherent. Objective measures to support your claims.
RFD:

I choose the affirmative in this debate because there was a presentation of the main components of the popular ACT & SAT tests coupled with evidence of the type of person this form of testing produces. I.E. - Human (machine) depicting a capitalist approach.

On the negative side, I would challenge a stronger core of the voluntary nature of the test taking - give alternative choices for circumventing this onerous process, flesh out more explanation of sub-standardized tests and their benefits.

Would like to see more of an argument emphasizing the faults of the tests, that everyone is taught the same material to achieve on these tests and how can these tests be changed, flesh out more, to better identify students and their desires for higher education. If tests are not to be considered in the College admissions process (UR) what should be? make a clearer argument on this aspect.

Great job overall!
interesting to see how Capstone alt. holds w/ inherent Gies in grading too

people still go to college col wait cld/would more students Gies
more income to college to get more admission staff (wholistic)
conceding FW also pieces burdens to increase education
interesting to see how you'll respond throughout

has GPA boosting occurred in SQ when some colleges are test-optional/GI (3nd) - great you did that

wonder how responses to full cau reform on fixing need/
gender Gies would hold?

spread prep better/tell me what flow you ste+on

start on the Neg in 1AR

unorganized rebuttal

your response to no stats could be framed a lot better

I vote because they win on FW of proved Gies repres in AF. NEG pro's could not...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Christian Hilgemann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</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>Ria Umesh Manathkar 4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>Rio Pham 22 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nah</td>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff:**
- Your case is dope. The Harlow card at the end seems a little out of place b/c it doesn’t link to your framework + has no inherency. Would consider crafting for judges who care about having a clear case story.
- Extending and explaining the Lash card in the LAR would have been really good. You bring it up in the LAR, and you make the empirics sound powerful, but I didn’t get that at all in the LAR, so I can’t evaluate it.

**Neg:**
- Addressing the aff framework in the LNR would have been really useful for winning the framework debate. As it is, it’s easy for aff to win by extending any of their FW args.
- You could have spent a lot more time in the dNR talking about WHY subjectivity is racist. As it is, I don’t really know why that’s the case, but I think you could have won that if you explained why it’s true and did some comparison to the aff.

**RFD:** The debate comes down to if the aff solves oppression or makes it worse, as agreed upon by both sides. The aff wins that SAT is biased and reentrenches poverty (via better evidence comparison). Neg has 2 arguments that try to turn aff’s solvency (Holistic admissions are subjective and thus racist—and private schools have more grade inflation). Neg doesn’t do enough work on the first in the dNR, so I prefer the warrants from the aff. Aff wins that minorities have higher GPAs, so they win the second as well. Thus, aff solves oppression and wins the round.
**Varsity LD Debate**

**Logan Guthrie ('16)**

**GUTHRIE, LOGAN**

**FAVRE, BRANDON**

**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 205</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Raunak Deb  
32 BASIS Peoria | Charlie Collins  
20 Gilbert High School | |
| Points  
(25-30) | Points  
(25-30) | |
| **2.75** | **2.55** | |

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

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

Judges Signature

Hamilton / Judge / PhD student  
School / Affiliation / Occupation

General feedback

- Diversity your impacts/claims more. Plenty of ink on race & socioeconomic status, but a few other impacts would be beneficial. (E.g. impact on economy, environment, war, etc.)
- Avoid looking at your opponent in CX; it's breaking up custom & makes debate a performance to the judge.
- Work on time mgmt. in IAR; some extensions left unmade & rebuttals left unaddressed.

RFD: Aff wins on LatheSpray card; demonstrates solvency works. Neg is harmed by contradictions. Aff wins PV debate. With these considerations, off wins.
### VLD

**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 210</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratik Shah</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Be careful about "we" being the United States. Figure out the actor.**

This global warming impact level calculated is not great since it's true.

Instead of going straight for the PIC, I didn't buy the ZAR reasoning for the PIC being bad because it doesn't give the K an educational chance. More comparative analysis on the relative CP should amount of colonialist mindset in the Aff vs the Neg. I think you could just do the Neg link harder into settler-colonialism than you do.

I need a specific reason for how the Neg standardized tests link into settler-colonialism. These reasons exist in the neoliberalism of the Neg. United states economic competitiveness is super settler-colonialist and oppressive.

**Jim Fountain Classic**

Eli Botham (*'17)

You could go for a turn on the Ritvan card. Good question: why did you choose land-based education?

Who is we? We are the United States. More analysis on AZ Aff w/ "we" - crystallize this better.

Find card for US settler-colonialism in itself. Be careful about saying "Net benefit?" US economic leadership this makes you link into the K & you since this is pretty much neoliberalism. Link of omission on the settler-colonialism supercedes all others - possibly due to lack of analysis. What I mean is don't go for this kind of omission unless you have capital analysis on why you did not enough analysis on the K & how specifically other minorities are impacted negatively.

This just proves that the Aff didn't understand the link arguments to the Negative from the K - like neoliberalism and US hegemony and language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Jim Fountain Classic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity LD Debate</strong></td>
<td>*<em>Lars Niemi (<em>1)</em></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 301</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</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:

"OUGHT NOT USE STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES"

**AFF:** Perfect delivery in constructive! A little flustered in cross!

Your evidence and logic was strong.

**NEG:** Well done, but advocating for the status quo didn't make as strong an argument as eliminating standardized test scores in college admissions...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Aster Measho (*'32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</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:

Calvin - able to back up his resolutions with examples and facts.

Zachary - did not negate all of the affirmatives - went over the allowed time twice.
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Micah Sandys (*'37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhenni Gao</td>
<td>Ben Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>2 Horizon Honors High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**
- lots of "uh"s and "um"s
- seemed very nervous
- Don't let nerves take control of you, girl!
- The more confident you force yourself to sound, the more confidence you'll feel!

**NEG**
- So, so quiet
- speak w/ confidence, king!

Aff had strong arguments, but I think nerves got to the better of you (we've all been there).

Neg had very strong evidence and even stronger impacts. Neg made a very big arg. against Aff E.W. that pretty much won him the round. GPA still being biased was also a very strong arg.
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Sharon Pocian (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ved Patil</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Claire Hartley</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Red Mountain High School</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:

**CLAIRED - TOO MANY "OMS"; NO NEED TO FORMULATE YOUR QUESTIONS.
BETTER; YOU MISPRONOUNCED MANY WORDS IN YOUR
CONSTRUCTION SPEECH; PRACTICE; NEED TO WORK ON
MAKING THOUGHTS FLOW BETTER; WATCH THE "OMS" AND SIGHTS.**

**VED - IT WOULD BE NICE TO HAVE CLEAR TAGS; IT
HELPS JUDGES A LOT; YOUR CONSTRUCTION SPEECH
WAS GOOD BUT LACKED DEFINED POINTS (TAGS);
GOOD JOB STICKING TO THE TIMES AND NOT GOING
OVER; DON'T USE "WE" AS A PRONOUN; THIS IS LD, NOT PF
SAY "I" OR "AFF"**

OVERALL THE AFF HAD STRONGER ARGUMENTS AND
CARDS; GREAT REBUTTAL POINT ABOUT
AZ MERC TASTING.)
Varsity LD Debate

Muzaffar Khan (*'22)

Round 3

Room 106

Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM

Affirmative

Meghan Kiley Munoz
33 Desert Ridge High School

Points
(25-30)
29

Negative

Chloe Legay
9 Horizon High School

Points
(25-30)
23

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- good presentation and supported arguments with examples
- Very good defense during the cross examination
- When you ask a question let the other person answer the question
- Don't cut them off (we)
- Good arguments in your own presentation
- Argument given to support the position were convincing

Cross examination good question during the cross examination
- good points brought up regarding the elite universities
- Defined the acronym during the presentation
- Presentation was good but it took almost half the debate to understand your position
- Good rebuttal question and the defense was good too.
- In your support to you had too much information to communicate to the audience and list them separately and jumping b/w the arguments
- Worst a good defense of the position
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 305</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaney Krieger</td>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **1:0**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF** provided more convincing evidence and arguments. **NEG** tried to provide a plan that fell short. Both outstanding debaters!

*Great passion and poise! Used (cards) references to her advantage. Extremely persuasive & knowledgeable.*

*Very effective cross, used specific questions to clarify and identify NEG position.*

*Very methodical! Excellent summary & convincing argument of NEG plan.*

*Specific cross and great challenge of (cards).*

*Very confident and convincing!*

*Great defense during cross.*

*Well composed, not rattled.*

*Strong and very convincing arguments! Addressed all the AFF's arguments!*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Jim Fountain Classic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity LD Debate</td>
<td>Lexie Vanderveen (*4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adyant Mishra  
32 BASIS Peoria | Parsa Amin  
22 Arizona College Prep |
| **Points**  
(25-30) | **Points**  
(25-30) |
| 29 | 28 |

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

- **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Strong evidence used for showing the score increases in relation to tutoring + test prep!
- Strong evidence when you mentioned that GPAs are generally higher for minorities + female students vs. lower test scores
- Didn't address Asian student benefit argument and could have done more to show that if there's benefits seen in optional testing, that there's the most benefit in no testing

**Neg**

- Strong support when you showed how higher scores predict more rigorous college courses!
- Good case for how scores help Asian students, but unclear how they'd truly suffer from no scores required
- I'd like more explanation for how test scores reveal inequality in schools and therefore makes them necessary
- Good job anticipating the Aff's rebuttals! Good argument for it pushing the burden from studying to elsewhere

RFD: Because there wasn't evidence to point to that would show extracurriculars as being more unfair than test scores, I wasn't convinced of the downsides to the Aff's "equal playing field" argument that would benefit minorities more than an option to submit scores or not.