

# The Final Round<sup>1</sup>

Everett Rutan

[ejrutan3@ctdebate.org](mailto:ejrutan3@ctdebate.org)

**Joel Barlow High School, December 10, 2022**

**THBT the college admissions process should be based on objectively measured student performance.**

## A Note about the Notes

These are my notes from the final round at Joel Barlow. They are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention “flowed” across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It’s closer to the way I take notes during the debate.

## The Final Round

The final round at Joel Barlow was between the New Canaan team of Grace Corcoran and Ankita Kuttachirayil on the Government and the Bethel team of Willa Zalaznick and Georgia O’Connor on the Negative. The debate was won by the Government team from New Canaan.

### 1) Prime Minister Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the motion
- c) Definition: “objectively measured student performance” are things like GPA (with strict weights based on courses taken), class rank, community involvement, awards, etc.
- d) Framework: equity.
- e) G1<sup>2</sup>: Students must meet the college’s requirements to succeed.
  - i) Students need to be qualified, prepared for the rigor of college
  - ii) Need to study takes away from ability to participate in other activities
  - iii) Non-academic activities are not rigorous
- f) G2: Subjective measures result in discrimination
  - i) Asian-Americans being excluded for “personality traits”
  - ii) GPA is a good predictor of academic success
    - (1) Requires student be good at many subjects
    - (2) Univ. Chicago study says 3.75 GPA is a dividing line for success

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright 2008 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

<sup>2</sup> “G1” indicates the Affirmative first contention, “N2” the Negative second contention and so forth.

- iii) Graduates get degrees, give donations, send their children to their college
  - iv) Harvard case says if admitted by GPA Asian-Americans would rise to 51% of the class from 25% now
  - v) Legacy admissions hurt lower income students.
    - (1) Without, white admissions would fall by 8%, Black/Latino rise by 9.5%
  - vi) Expensive extra-curriculars also discriminate
  - g) G3: Colleges are selective and secretive
    - i) Rich families hire counselors with relationships with admissions offices
    - ii) So many apply there is pressure to lie about sex, race, etc., to increase chances

***POI: Can't the rich also pay for tutors to improve grades?***

    - iii) GPA has predictive value, and is still a wholistic measure
  - h) What is best for the students?
- 2) Leader of the Opposition Constructive**
- a) Intro
  - b) Outline: State contentions, reply to Gov, present Opp case
  - c) Our contentions are
    - i) Diminishes collegiate values
    - ii) Campus diversity
    - iii) Classism
  - d) G1: Many students meet the GPA requirement.
    - i) The admissions problem is how to distinguish among them
  - e) G2: A homogenous student population is not good
    - i) Diversity has value that the best colleges cultivate
  - f) G3: It is the prerogative of the college to set its own standards
    - i) Dishonesty will be a problem under any system
  - g) O1: Diminishes collegiate values
    - i) Students are more than their GPA or SAT scores
      - (1) There are many other tangible measures
      - (2) GPA/SAT ignore the struggles many students face
    - ii) Low GPA/SAT does not mean student is unqualified
      - (1) But when more meet this standard, how do you choose
      - (2) Need other factors
  - h) O2: Campus diversity
    - i) Need a diverse student population to prepare for the real world
    - ii) No one group should dominate
      - (1) Homogeneity benefits no one
  - i) O3: Classism
    - i) Money matters
      - (1) Rich can hire tutors, pay to repeat tests, for extracurriculars
    - ii) Poor often need jobs, sacrifice simply to go to school
      - (1) Demonstrating hard work should matter
  - j) Framework is what is best for the students
    - i) Only Opp achieves diversity
    - ii) Classism: don't discriminate based on money
      - (1) Judge students by widest range of factors
- 3) Member of Government Constructive**

- a) Intro
  - b) O1: Gov levels the playing field
    - i) The poor can't afford elite sports
    - ii) "Struggle" does not measure the best candidate
    - iii) Rich person with high GPA is not a poor candidate
  - c) O2: Admissions offices are biased
    - i) One person can harm many students
    - ii) Objective GPA eliminates this bias
      - (1) Engineering is male dominated
      - (2) Women should get in with the same grades
  - d) O3: many things are influenced by money
    - i) Extracurriculars, recommendations, etc.
    - ii) E.g., refer to G3
      - (1) Access to info on admissions helps to write better application essays
  - e) G1: Many now get in as legacies at places like Harvard
 

**POI: How will you abolish legacies?**

    - i) Ignore them, keep information off the application

**POI: What about donations?**

    - ii) Motion is "objective measures of student performance" which excludes donations.
 

**POI: Won't admission officers see the student's name?**
    - iii) Too many POIs. I've already answered 2.
    - iv) GPA is the best predictor of performance
  - f) G2: Opp says Asians are disproportionately admitted
    - i) Good students are left out due to subjective admissions
    - ii) Not equally represented according to ability
  - g) G3: Why is it a college's prerogative to set any standard?
    - i) This ignores equity
    - ii) This does not provide best environment for students
    - iii) Replace subjectivity with standards
      - (1) E.g., use GPA not legacy status
- 4) Member of the Opposition Constructive**
- a) Intro, motion
  - b) Outline: Opp then Gov
  - c) Restate O1, O2, O3
  - d) G1: Gov values academic above things like economics, contributions to one's community
    - i) GPA does not measure rigor
      - (1) Ignores character, grit, hard work, extracurriculars
    - ii) Ignores how socio-economics affects academic performance

POI: Does a bad home automatically mean a low GPA?

    - iii) Money can pay for APs, tutors, etc.
      - (1) Need to struggle economically will lower GPA
  - e) O1: GPA doesn't define you
    - i) GPA pressure is unhealthy

- (1) E.g., in Japan, 28/100,000 students commit suicide each year vs 6 in the US
- (2) Suicides would rise under Gov
- ii) Better to educate students to be good citizens
- POI: How do you measure character***
- iii) Extracurriculars, social background, minority status, etc.
- f) O2: US is a very diverse country
  - i) Gov ignores need to let all groups in
  - ii) Diversity leads to better discourse on issues
- g) O3: Harder to get a good GPA if you have to work
  - i) Harms low income and minority students
    - (1) Need to give them a chance
- 5) Leader of Opposition Rebuttal**
  - a) Outline: Opp case, clash, impacts
  - b) Repeat O1, O2, O3
  - c) Clash: Diversity
    - i) Opp acts against bias
      - (1) Recognizes disadvantages faced by low-income students
      - (2) Work, family, etc., may indicate ability
    - ii) How do we measure these?
      - (1) Hard, but it is the right thing to do
      - (2) Look at essays, portfolios, accomplishments
  - d) Impacts:
    - i) “This House” was never defined
      - (1) We define it as everyone in this room
    - ii) What is best for you?
      - (1) Education, diversity, human complexity
      - (2) Academics are not the whole picture
      - (3) Numbers don’t measure human beings
- 6) Prime Minister Rebuttal**
  - a) Intro, motion
  - b) Outline: Gov, Opp, Weighing
  - c) Gov: framework was equity
    - i) Look at all students equally based on performance
    - ii) G1: Students need to meet the school’s requirements
      - (1) All students face difficulties, not just those cited by Opp
      - (2) Treat all students equally
    - iii) G2: Subjective admissions leads to discrimination
      - (1) There is no one right way
    - iv) G3: Secrecy gives the wealthy an advantage
  - d) Weighing
    - i) Recall our POI on how to measure character
      - (1) Minority/poor students not necessarily good students
      - (2) Can’t measure this from an essay
      - (3) Thousands of applications; better to limit information used
    - ii) Two worlds

- (1) Admit the best candidates
  - (a) Better as future graduates, will give back to school and society
- (2) Application process is stressful
  - (a) Drop all the little stuff, emphasis on ‘uniqueness’
  - (b) Less stress on all the students
- e) Repeat G1, G2, G3