

<b>58</b>	<b>Matt Conrad - La Reina</b>	
	<b>FLIGHT: B</b>	
<b>Room: E3 508</b>	Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM	
<b>11</b>	2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
	<b>Soon Please!</b>	
<b>Affirmative:</b> Nova 42 Academy CC		<b>Negative:</b> Academy of Higher Learning CK
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>
Chloe Chun	<u>80</u>	Chenya Kwon
		<u>75</u>
<b>Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate</b>		Low Point Win? _____
<u>Matt Conrad</u>		<u>La Reina</u>
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- ① Oral critique.
- ② Neg is good but needs more preparation - nerves and doesn't know case so it hurts.
- ③ Aff asks good questions in CK and is gracious to an inexperienced opponent - THANK YOU for that.  
Just need to work on flowing and summary/voters at end
- ④ Good start looks! It only gets easier from here.

51

# Victor Hugo Herrera - ELAC

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Nova 42 Academy ES

**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning SB

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Esha Salman

95

Sansur Borijn

88

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

*Victor*

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff:

- Well-constructed arguments, but a lot of it is theoretical with no numerical evidence. In this instance, it is important to better analyze the value, or lack there-of, of the resolution. Your impacts are strong and relevant to your case.

- You dropped a lot of Neg Arguments.
- Your second speech was not an elaboration, just a repetition.

Neg:

- The accuracy of SAT's predictions does not necessarily negate that there may be inequality. It is important to link your argument to how it shuts Aff's argument down.
- You state there is no longer bias, but do not elaborate or provide evidence to support your claim.
- You listen well, but analyze and deconstruct more. Don't leave interpretation to judge.
- Good job calling out redundancy of Aff.



AFF 2:

Remaining Prop time.  
Towards the time

Always /

(2) Under Bill

to carry out

to carry out

to carry out

to carry out

- best

to carry out

~~to carry out~~

### Judges Notes AFF

• Give us an alternative.

What could you have done to fix this problem?

• Conventions were good.

• Good job. If you pressed up your claim with by providing a resolution your argument would have stand.

6 A  
3 C  
7 A  
3 C  
4 A  
1 N  
5 A

by

to carry out with your committee

- way to correct

to carry out

Very good. Check your time. 2-3 minutes over

### Judges Notes Neg

• Work on time management.

Very good arguing points take ~~10~~ opp.

• If you speed up / compressed your case you would have gotten to your DA.

• Since your counter argument towards AFF's case were reasonable. you ~~are~~ won.

JSFG - to PA Dist. background

<b>54</b>		<b>Rhinell Navarro - ELAC</b>	
		<b>FLIGHT: B</b>	
<b>Room: E3 517</b>		Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM	
<b>11</b>		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
<b>Soon Please!</b>			
<b>Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning OC</b>		<b>Negative: Nova 42 Academy GR</b>	
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
Olivia Cha	<u>95</u>	Gavin Rossi	<u>96</u>
<b>Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.</b>		Low Point Win? _____	
<u>10/26</u>		<u>ELAC</u>	
<b>JUDGE'S SIGNATURE</b>		<b>JUDGE'S AFFILIATION</b>	

95% allowed for determined success  
 50% success

Equal OPP

(2) Control/ money  
 A) college success SAT  
 B) college success  
 C) college success A

(3) Control/ money  
 JPD Down whites/pwr.  
 ...  
 ...  
 ...

(4) Control/ money / SAT  
 ...  
 ...  
 ...

(5) Quality  
 ...  
 ...  
 ...

Noji ... - quality of life

(1) ...  
 A) SAT your success  
 - wealth  
 B) ...  
 (2) ...  
 A) ...  
 B) ...

(3) Quality of life  
 A) ...  
 B) ...

(4) ...  
 A) ...  
 B) ...

(5) ...  
 A) ...

(6) ...  
 A) ...  
 B) ...

"LIFE AND UNIQUE"

AFFEE:

Don't say "I'm a SAT" ✓

Don't say "I'm a SAT" ✓

Tip: go back to

Your arguments

You have great

ideas, restate what

you said.

## Judges Notes AFF

---

• Very strong argument.

~~Not seen~~

• What's your judging criteria?

Very. I'm a SAT... predetermined to accept... results

...and opportunities.

argument.

## Judges Notes Neg

---

• The judging criteria was set, however through the lenses of quality of life. You did not give me something to compare with the problems you were assessing.

50

# Victor Hugo Herrera - ELAC

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership  
JW

**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning JP

Name	PTS (100-70)
Julianne Wu	<u>75</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Jun-Woo Pak	<u>73</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff:

Neg:

- You presented your case with significantly more clarity in your second speech than your first. Why? Because you stopped spreading. Spread is, arguably, a valid tactic but if done inefficiently it harms the strength of your case.
- Instead of 20 arguments, half of which were practically the same, simplify and combine them.

- I hardly know your arguments because of your inefficient spread.
- Use cross-ex better. You asked the same question for 3 minutes and got the same answer.
- Careful with demeaning rhetoric. Everyone who wants education should get it.

— Word economy.

- You did not set parameters.

53

# Sofelia Wilkenman - ELAC

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

Room: E3 521

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning MD

**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership NC

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Mahir Doe

85

Nathan Chen

90

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

Sofie Wilks  
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

for hire  
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

expand more on links & impact  
good str  
great at answering CX!  
good instinct

~~answer~~ answer! some CX questions  
incorrectly  
great con  
good job catching how part of  
aff's case agrees w/ part of your  
case  
lg

57

# Matt Conrad - La Reina

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership  
DW

**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning WK

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Daniel Wu

27 85

Wonjong Ko

28 85

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- ① I vote neg ~~A~~ on FW - more weighing in neg word. Also better evidence comparison.
- ② Aff needs to extend more arguments in IAR - hurts
- ③ Both sides need to fill CX & speaking time.
- ④ Very good for your age!

49

# Ethan Chang - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

Room: E3 525

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning AL

**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning TH

Name	PTS (100-70)
Allen Li	<u>AC</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Timothy Ha	<u>95</u>

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

Kudos

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

neg case dropped and aff doesn't respond to case answers

52

# Ethan Chang - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: B

Room: E3 525

Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

11

Soon Please!

**Affirmative:** Nova 42 Academy AP

**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning DC

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Andy Pan

99

Daniel Choi

98

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

need to have better answers to neg case  
low impact case  
explain why it matters  
under your VC

NEG

need weighing  
need to realize not a link debate  
bc aff doesn't need a case aff

4/2/11  
3

56		<b>Fidi Jimenez - ModernBrain</b>	
		FLIGHT: B	
Room: E3 457		Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM	
11		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
<b>Soon Please!</b>			
Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM		Negative: Nova 42 Academy JJ	
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
James Miller	07	Jeremiah Jung	09
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.			Low Point Win? <u>Yes</u>
<u>[Signature]</u>		<u>Modern Brain</u>	
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION	

- Standardizing testing - broken
- exam scores given in standard manner
- Value: Justice - greatest benefit to least advantage.
- 1) Gender bias
  - HS girls have higher performances but excluded from low SAT scores
  - Prevents 12,000 woman from entering university
  - 300 billion missed scholarships
- 2) Racial bias
  - Guard to white students & widens gap of equality b/w race in education
  - Black student have ↓ scores than whites b/c of language choice
  - Lack of access & structural barriers

- Made sure to not ask Y/N in questions, try to ask ones that force explanation
- use, values / content / such points / arguments
- value: Social welfare - collective value to uphold society
- Quality of life
  1. Great inflation
    - a. GPA biased
    - Math students / teachers are favored less
    - Underestimation of policies & discourages
  2. Racism & stress ↑ chance for health problems
  3. GPA is biased ↑ rankings
  - .27% - higher income has better environments & chances for inform
- 3. Standardized testing
  - Access math & english skills not reflective of socioeconomic discrimination
  - ↑ success & evaluation corrected

### 3 Wealth discrimination

- wealth provides better opportunities & some pay to place in 6IV classes, to allow

- no time limit on SAT

- Not a good measure - only ~~20~~ 20/30% of variance - 70-75% unaccounted for

- not based on intelligence & created test training industry that creates a large gap

- Do not buy status via expensive education

- Solvency - ~~not~~ ~~not~~ consequentialism is not seen as described by negation

- Quality of life through increased education will have a quality of life

- no evidence on Q's bias

- women are attending college more than males & graduating

- will not impact as women will still graduate soon

- Racial inequality is accounted for in band score ~~score~~

- standardized testing removes biases → who created it?

- ↳ test is easier to revise than education system

- lowers GPA's

- Quality of life M/IF college students admitted will ↓ quality. standardized ~~test~~ Q's

*Handwritten notes on the left margin, partially obscured by a large scribble.*

59		<b>Fidi Jimenez - ModernBrain</b>	
		FLIGHT: A	
Room: E3 457		Open LD - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 2 - 11:00AM	
11		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
<b>Soon Please!</b>			
<b>Affirmative:</b> Academy of Higher Learning NH		<b>Negative:</b> Kudos College of Youth Leadership RX	
<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
Nelson Hu	100	Rachel Xu	95
<b>Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.</b>		Low Point Win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>Judge's Signature</u> <i>[Signature]</i>		<u>Judge's Affiliation</u> Modern Brain	

11 (5:21)

• Stand. fee - feeds funding / economy  
 - Believed standardized testing is inefficient

- Justice - Value - advantage  
 least advanced - equity

1. Gender biases

- Woman produced or assumed will perform worse

- 12,000 woman one denied entry

• Girls Perform better than males in education

• ST is built for male mindset  
 - creates missed opportunities

2. Racial bias

• widens gap of social rank

*Notes:*  
 less for stand  
 common of class

- during cross ex. try to ask Q's that are not Yes/No. It leads to a response that doesn't further debate

• Bring volume up, it was a little hard to hear you - I cannot hear when F do not buy argument

utilitarianism → equality

2) Consequentialism  
 1) GPA = SAT Score

• methods to replace do not exist

• Affluent parents have more resources & only do so to secure their privilege

standardized tests - boasts # of applicants - test optional

• correlation not causation  
 • learning same curriculum / do worse?  
 • stratified college programs  
 but is it same, not same, same

White students are favored as uses language common to them & not other

? favor Wealthy

- Income ↑ inscore
- tutoring
- educational assistance
- better environment
- new created to examine critical thinking
- 1.7 billion cost on standard test - use this to fund education
- for profit cooperation

• Done play around with suit

• Good protection & speed

• Good correction

• remember to weigh on mechanism & value which

has most income

education common structure  
 grade inform compared by SAT  
 admits on formula → not good at taking the test?  
 it's reduce needs to be a bit better

• Say inequity doesn't exist, but wealth is used as a mechanism. So you admitted through cost structure that inequities do exist among students

RFD: Neg never defended mechanism & value