| **Student Name:** Alvina Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require politicians and their families to use only public services (e.g. public schools, public healthcare facilities, public transport etc.) |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | NA | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  Let’s move away from the ‘imagine’! We can characterise that the politicians ignore the public outside of this by explaining that politicians are out of touch, that they make empty promises - because they themselves live a life of privilege - and then move on.  When signposting, we should just say: first, set-up, then 2 arguments, the first on x, the second on y; you shouldn’t tell me that you’ll have a conclusion - this is expected!  Set-up   * Don’t take a POI in the middle of set-up! Take it at transition points, so after set-up, before your first argument, or after your first argument, before your second. It means you sound smoother! * When responding to the POI, this highlights the lack of explanation as to WHY currently they’re bad; is it because these are important but not voting issues, they can get away with it; we need to make them personally vested.   Argument 1   * Is the problem belief? For instance, is it that public hospitals are bad, because the elected official doesn’t care, or is it that the public hospital is good, but that because elected officials don’t use them, we just *perceive* them to be bad? The problem identification needs to be clearer! Which argument or impact do you think is more valuable? * We need to explain why they didn’t prior, and are now; many politicians *can* afford private services, but the proposition argues that their *choice* to use them creates a disconnect with the public and undermines their commitment to improving those very services.   + Politicians now have a direct stake in their quality; they experience the consequences of their policy decisions firsthand.   + If a politician's child attends a failing public school, they will face greater pressure to address the issues plaguing that school. * We need to pay attention to the mechanisms - what leads to the change that we claim we get; we should analyse existing incentives of politicians and then how they shift once this requirement kicks in.   Argument 2   * Clear argument about gaining information about the problem; why is this unique?   + Why can’t voters just tell them? Why don’t they listen to voters at present? * Clear identification of fairness; is the impact on the happiness of the poor, or them getting the necessary public services + that they are of quality such that they can prosper/achieve a better life/viable attempt at social mobility?   Clear tone, clear delivery, we need to spend more time thinking about the problem characterisation + uniqueness of our mechanisms.  06:53 - excellent work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require politicians and their families to use only public services (e.g. public schools, public healthcare facilities, public transport etc.) |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 69 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  You could illustrate this, by explaining NIMBYism, or bureaucracy, or how much money it takes to make these fixes; we dropped an ‘or whatever’ immediately here!  Set-up   * Let’s move away from literal explanations; characterise the purpose of public services - equalise paying field, the nature of politicians - natural incentives to be engaged, opportunity cost in terms of budget allocations and so forth. * Violate right to life? This is a pretty extreme burden.   Rebuttal   * Don’t refer to existing incentives existing - explain them!   + Re-election, average person uses these, voting blocs, unions. * Why isn’t there enough funding?   + You need to establish just WHY public services are so hard to fix up!     - Public services often involve large, complex bureaucracies with established procedures and hierarchies. These bureaucracies can be resistant to change and innovation, making it difficult to implement reforms quickly or efficiently.     - Political interference and short-term thinking can hinder long-term planning and investment in public services. Politicians may prioritize short-term gains over long-term sustainability, leading to inconsistent funding and policy changes.   Argument 1   * Good work running the principle! Start by establishing why a politician is still a private person - and especially their family, who could not consent to this. * Fair pinpointing security concerns - explain why this person and their security matters more compared to the symbolic effect; you can also point out how this leads only to a veneer of change   **Security Concerns:** Prominent politicians and their families may face legitimate security concerns that make using public services impractical or unsafe. Private services often offer enhanced security measures that are not available in public settings.  **Quality and Availability of Public Services:** In some areas, public services may not be of the same quality or availability as private alternatives. Requiring politicians to use subpar services could negatively impact their ability to perform their duties effectively.  **Unintended Consequences for Public Services:** An influx of politicians and their families into public services could strain resources and potentially create longer wait times or reduced quality of service for other users.  **Disincentive to Public Service:** Requiring politicians to use only public services, particularly if those services are perceived as inadequate, could discourage talented individuals from entering public life. This could lead to a less qualified and representative political class.  **Focus on Symbolic Gestures over Substantive Change:** Requiring politicians to use public services is a symbolic gesture that doesn't necessarily address the underlying issues affecting the quality and accessibility of those services. Real change requires policy reforms and increased investment, not just symbolic acts. | | | | | | |