<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Kayla Green (*'4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 122</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Collins</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Gilbert High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Kan</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **No**

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

Judge's Signature: **Hamilton**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg due to concession of cap K and case turn: that getting rid of standardized tests allow for more emphasis on subjective measures to evaluate students who don't have access to them.
Affirmative: Effectively demonstrated fundamental racism exists in standard testing. Most effective argument showed that bias exists in the testing itself—speed of male test takers, for instance. The questions about the Fagan Holland test created enough doubt to challenge the negative argument.

Negative: Excellent arguments about grade inflation and over watching that affirm did not fully dispute. However, the crux of the dispute. However, the crux of the argument was whether the Fagan Holland test could be implemented to solve all of the current problems with SAT/ACT not enough evidence.
VLD

Varsity LD Debate

Logan Guthrie (*'16)

Round 4
Room 124
Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM

Affirmative

Points
28.8

Sohani Sandhu
22 Arizona College Prep

Negative

Points
28.6

Malachi Mendel
11 BASIS Phoenix

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote affirmative on the risk that eliminating standardized testing increases diversity and socioeconomic equity which outweighs the race expression of the U. DNA favors terminal impact calculus. Race as social construct not explained in context of all turns: racism possible in LVC.
**Varsity LD Debate**

**Round 4**

**Maaanik Chotalla (27,32)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Tempe Preparatory Academy</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**

Martha

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Brophy/Couch/Builder of Bodies

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I like the case overall but am wondering what the impact of reading the poetry is in round 4.
- I'd have liked more interaction with the line by line on the neg responses to the aff.
- 2AR was solid, built upon the IAR really well.

**AFF**

RFQ: I affirm with the poetry framing and active learning impacts. Neg needs to better warrant arguments about the policymaking being needed, otherwise it is hard to come back.

**NEG**

- You're a great speaker but the neg needs a biggerutil.
- No more work on warranting your framework, why do I need policymaking?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 308</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajni Nimesh Patel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Adyant Mishra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't argue in CX / you do need a solution advocate
- "we can't change math to fit indigenous people"
- a little messy, regrettable
- would like more FW focus in HR
- GPA inflation response needs a better response
- States rights - nat. tax
- want indigenous arg. to be stronger
- what about int. students?

I vote AFF, neg wasn't able to effectively prove CPs would work. Also GPA gressed seems less than SAT/test gressed.
# VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Lauren Barney (*34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**  
Abhigyan Kumar Shukla  
4 Hamilton High School  
Points (25-30): 25  

**Negative**  
Delaney Krieger  
22 Arizona College Prep  
Points (25-30): 27

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

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

Judge's Signature: **B**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **DV**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think there's a risk of the aff making strides in decreasing bias. I could have gotten more ink on the non ug argument.

I think the aff wins that GPA is a good metric.

Not sure why neg needed to read a separate framework. Maybe frame the aff as an anti-racist moment.

Also unsure about the stereotype threat impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 210</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity LD Debate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Micah Sandys (*'37)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Pham</td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Evidences are stronger
2. Attacked almost all opponent’s points during cross examination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 207</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</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>Savannah Elizabeth McNamara</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

**Affirmative**

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

**Judge’s Signature**

BASIS Peoria Teacher

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

The aff argument seemed to be about life’s absurdity and our search for meaning (existential sig.)—chasing objectivity. Since we do not have objectivity, the testing is futile. Specifics followed about stiffing our search for meaning and negatives stemming from tests.

The neg focused on utility (greatest good). Claimed this is the natural inclination for people. Put forth a number of points on the pro of tests (cheaper, standardize, promotes interest in seen).

Both sides did a great job disputing issues presented so the decision rests on the value set forth. If neg had more reasons/evidence for utility being in natural state he could have taken it. The prison example was not enough on its own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Bita Taji ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Legay</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Eckstein</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? **10**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

GRiffin- GREAT EYE CONTACT DURING CONSTRUCTION SPEECH, DON'T PLAY WITH YOUR LAPTOP COVER WHILE TALKING, KEEP YOUR HANDS STILL (DON'T FIDDLE WITH OR CLICK YOUR PEN EITHER).

CHLOE- GOOD JOB ADDRESSING NEG'S POINTS IN REBUTTAL

NEG Addressed all Aff's contentions very well; Really liked the line "TEACHING FACTS IS NOT OPPRESSION"; THAT WAS A GREAT POINT AND A TURNING POINT IN THE NEG CASE;

OVERALL BETTER AND MORE LOGICAL REASONING FROM NEG.
I don't understand the "Alt doesn't need to prove solvency" argument. If your attacks on the standardized tests are real world impacts, why is solvency not important?

Pass Neg on explanations and warrants. If they confused, keep pressing them to explain.

Don't get flustered by Ks. Treat them as you would any other argument. Attack the link, or the amount, or the Alt's solvency.

"Permj do both" is a phrase to learn. Make sure to address Rule of the Ballot. There is a path to victory had you won on framework.

Bad question on Neg burden.

In your attack on Aff's formulation, you pointed to your K which seems to reject current education models entirely.

Use all your time. I specifically wanted to hear a more direct statement on the Alt's 2nd contention and greater extensions on the K. You had 15 seconds left so that's definitely enough to address these points better.

Point out that Aff conceded the Alt and the Rob
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 205</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett David Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bennett - detailed information point by point
- well response for cross x questions.

Meghan - good cross x questions.
- Could not provide evidence where she got some of her information.
VLD

Varsity LD Debate                  Lars Niemi (*1)

Round 4                              Room 211                  Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM

**Affirmative**                      **Negative**

Points (25-30)                       Points (25-30)
Ben Brady                           Raunak Deb
2 Horizon Honors High School        32 BASIS Peoria
29                                  26

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** GOOD PACE; EASY TO UNDERSTAND. GREAT EVIDENCE & LOGIC. YOU MADE A BETTER CASE!

**NEG:** ALTHOUGH YOU MADE GOOD POINTS FOR KEEPING STANDARDIZED TESTS, SOME THINGS WERE CONTROVERSIAL INTUITIVE. LIKE: TESTING INCREASES SCHOLARSHIPS, YET POOR SCORES ARE LESS LIKELY TO GET SCHOLARSHIPS.

NEG DIDN'T ADDRESS AFF'S CONTENTION 2 (CIRCUMSTANTIAL DISADVANTAGES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Muzaffar Khan (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 120</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>Saif Agha</td>
<td>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was <strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? <strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature**

**ACP**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good presentation and the arguments look convincing.
- Good defense of his position.
- Your cross examination questions were good, brought good points for the opponent to defend.
- Good counterparts made a good argument in their support.
- Good points had you and good presentation but the opponent’s side arguments are stronger.
- Cross questions were good but the opponent made a good defense.
- Good presentation and supported the position with examples.
- Good point and counterpoints awarded for defending the opponent questions.
- Good counterpoints. Points made were good and clear.
- Good examples in support.
- Do not interrupt the opponent after asking a question, let the otherperson complete the answer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 301</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Cougar Phillips</td>
<td>Ved Patil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-80)</td>
<td>Points (25-80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**
- At times words got away from you and you lost your place.
- Good handle of DA & CP arguments.

**NEG**
- You should stand during all aspects of debate.
- Why don't you tell us college tests are better?
- Why no data? Your CP has so many holes - let's see if AFF brings this up.
- If you run a CP in LD, it better be extremely solid and have all aspects just "thinning stuff out" no data doesn't fly.
- You shouldn't have to tell me in crossex - it should be in your case.
- I don't flow CX.

**RFD**
- AFF wins on eliminating CP & CP to Silvramay because all of it is in the AFF world anyway. AFF's last argument about if we equal playing field and everyone scores - then why use for deeming my scholarship.
VLD

Varsity LD Debate
Eli Botham (*'17)

Round 4 Room 304 Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM

Affirmative
Claire Hartley
28 Red Mountain High School
Points (25-30)

Negative
Lucas Grajales
11 BASIS Phoenix
Points (25-30)

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Implications of racism:
  - test prep
  - Barriers to college

- Meta-analysis
  - validity not mentioned
  - predictive

- Future
  - test-retest reliability
  - can't achieve equity

- GPA: Stated above

- Should only rely on GPA
  - but this isn't what she said

- We do use these tools to get into college

- Holistic: all inclusive
  - Teacher recommendation
# VLD

## Varsity LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 201</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya Conroy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zhenni Gao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- standardized tests, ought not to use
- Race biased
- Language biased
- Seat - Disabilities + GPA
- Good question
- Majority + Minority
- GPA
- Good presentation skills

Weighted vs unweighted?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Parsa Amini 22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Affirmative:
- Good contentions on report cheating, race/gender inequality, Justice & structural violence in the workplace with workers - tool defense of car & attack on N's side

Negative:
- Tests had us, hard, US ranked internationally. Hard work 100% American, GDP, unemployment job statistic. Good job on defense side - went after claims, women lower score

Using framework - Aff had strong arguments - Blanks + holes in lower #5 + tie score. Committed & polite + job well - touched on overall structural bias of tests & education.

Good debate. Nice work on both.
# VLD

## Varsity LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Camille Hensel (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
<td>Ria Umesh Manathkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
<td>Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **AF**
  - **edg** evidence
  - ** exhibition of minority & inves**
  - **tle students under performance on sat tests. But not able to directly prove that says cross exam skills lack.**
  - **good cross exam skills lack.**

- **NF**
  - **edg**
  - **excellence of racis**
  - **s**
  - **Arguments**
  - **school test scores**
  - **same reason for inequality & errors in mental differentiating scoring processes**
  - **lot of preaching comments” on importance of equality without distinguishing what are the key factors that cause racial inequality other than sat scores.**

- **old data before changes were made to sat tests and financial barriers favor poor students.**

- Needs to be more crisp in cross exam

- Needs to speak more slowly and avoid so many breaks in major points and value number of ads.