| **Student Name:** Tania |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THS the use of fear to instill values in children. |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Speaking time: 06:58.27, good work!   * Great confidence, especially at the start. * Nice job for the hook! * Scope of debate: when you define it as ‘only little things that we tell to children’ - that may be quite limiting.   + You should address wider scope: is this debate also about parents using strong ideas such as how cheaters always get caught, or karma, or even that people will not accept you?   + I suggest you use more examples to cover a wider spectrum of the debate. * Try to make sure that you are explaining why fear is something that can motivate you sustainably; at some point, these kids are going to grow up and presumably see through the fear. How will they still be a moral actor in this equation? * Try to make sure that you are defining what exactly fear looks like as well; this is crucial for you as your opponents will try to make you defend the worst version of fear. * Try to explain why the alternatives to fear are not effective; what might these alternatives look like? * Good job bringing the preemptive.   + It was a good decision to make it a part of your substantive material embedded within the argument.   + The point you picked is about how the opp would suggest that this can cause trauma. Good pick as its very likely that the opp will talk about it. * The point about compliance is interesting. You connected it with how the child will comply with respecting others or eating healthy food.   + Can you incorporate examples of what sort of fear would work here?   + Can you explain more on how or why that approach will work specifically for children who might be disobedient? * Try to make sure to maintain the energy you had at the beginning of your speech throughout the speech; this helps to make sure that the judge is engaging with you throughout the story! * Try to make sure that you are explaining not just that a child will listen when fear is used, but that fear also benefits them. This could be something that helps the child realise and understand the idea of right and wrong, etc. The point is, try to make sure that you are actively taking into account how your position benefits these kids. * If you forget where you are in a speech, make sure that you take a drink of water or something to distract or cover up the idea that you lost your train of thought, etc. * Try to make sure to give me numerous reasons for why parents cannot reason with their kids. * Try to also explore why a lack of cooperation is a bad thing; could this harm parent and child relations, etc? * The point about the alternative (lectures) is a good one. However, are there other alternatives as well that the opp might come up with? If so, provide an interpretation. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Maddie |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THS the use of fear to instill values in children. |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  Speaking time:   * Good hook; but try to get the point of the hook a lot sooner. I feel like the opening line was quite drawn out. * While it's important to point out why the idea of using monsters as a tool for fear is a bad idea, it is also important that you tackle the proposition on the level of how they defined fear.   + You can talk about how fear exists and is imposed in other ways as well besides pinky falling off or monsters haunting kids. * When you critic why fear is bad for children, its important to:   + Establish how under your side, you achieve obedience as well. What are other ways besides fear that work?   + Early on in the debate, mention the alternatives and spend a good amount of time interpreting them. The idea about ‘talking to your children/telling them why its bad’ came after 3 minutes.   + Isn’t it the case that negotiation/talking is a much more difficult approach to get short-term results? You can argue that it works well in the long-term. What are the impacts of it? * The argument that children will associate their parents with fear is a great one to bring!   + Can we connect it with why children under the prop’s world will not really understand ‘why’ its important to do/not-do certain things.   + Is there a way of connecting this with how we do not instill a good level of wisdom in children? Example: when a child is polite because its afraid instead of understanding that its the right thing to do, the child will choose not to be polite when there is no fear. * Good signposting! * For the monster rebuttal, I understand where you are coming from, but I think you could go further to say that this is probably not what fear looks like; fear looks like fearing the parent, etc. It’s not as innocent as the OG suggests! * I like the idea that children will not have a good moral compass; try to tell me about why it matters that a child doesn’t do the wrong thing VS that child doesn’t do the wrong thing and at the same time, understands why something is a bad idea. * I think comparing a child to a dog may not be the best approach. Try to make sure to perhaps explain that children can and will comprehend logic; children can understand if you explain that there are certain dangers and or bad implications when they do something that is not right. * Try to make sure that you are actively flagging where your argument clashes with the other side; this will help to give the judge an idea of how and or why certain material is wrong. * Try to talk about how fear impacts a child; this could be an analysis on firstly how the use of fear makes children more fearful, anxious, etc. * Try to make sure that the comparison is obvious in the debate; this helps to make sure that the judge will vote for you!   Speaking time: 07:21.93 , good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Aria |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THS the use of fear to instill values in children. |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:   * Good hook! * I like the clarification that this version of fear won’t be horrible to the extent that it harms people; try to explain why parents don't have an incentive to scare their children that badly! * Nice personal example(s). * Good job re-establishing the examples of ‘fear’. However:   + Do you think you’re touching upon broad examples and somewhat harsh examples? For instance, if a parent suggests to their child that they will stop loving them, and that everyone else will do too - is that also applicable in this debate? * For the rebuttal about doing things for the reward, I don’t quite understand why this is different from what you are already proposing; moreover, I don’t understand what the harm of this is. Does this mean that people will now expect rewards to be a good person? Try to imagine what society will be like if this is widespread. * Try to make sure that you are signposting and also structuring your argumentation; it was a bit difficult for me to figure out what was being said and why it is being said in the debate. * Good call-out re:extreme examples and also for taking them to town for it! * Great handgestures! * Interesting example about the camping rules. To take it further:   + Can we connect it with how in difficult circumstances and where negotiation/talking doesn’t help, fear becomes important. * When you mention that the opposition is talking about the extremes of cases, what are they? * ‘Fear of being caught’ and ‘fear of being found out’ are insufficient to establish the overall scope of ‘fear’. Try providing more examples that are a little harsher. * Make sure that you explain why your impacts are actually bigger in the debate; * The later interpretation of fear that you provided, i.e. what happens when children don’t learn to fear consequences, is a very interesting point to bring up in this debate.   + Good job linking it with the fear of authority, although, showing ‘how’ it happens would be beneficial. Example: it is only when people fear consequences, they respect authority. Imagine a kid that has learned that being caught for bad behavior by the police is both wrong as well as can lead to bad outcomes, the likeliness of the child's respect as well as cooperating with police becomes much higher in the long run. Hence, long-term impacts of a certain level of fear are very important! * Good interpretation about how 5 year olds don’t understand from lectures alone.   + Can you also rebut how negotiation/talking/lecture is simply one part of explaining kids, and how that becomes more effective when parents utilize fear as a reasonable tactic?   Speaking time: 07:04.02, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Amber |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THS the use of fear to instill values in children. |
| --- |

| 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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:   * Nice hook! Good attempt at comedy. * Now you’ve established that it causes ‘lack of trust’ which is an important idea to rebuild the first speaker’s case.   + Over the course of the speech, its extremely important to show the impacts, preferably many as opposed to few. * Good volume and projection! I like the passion. * Try to make sure that you are explaining how and why people will end up becoming resentful; why is this the case? * When you argue that parents are terrorizing children, you must back this characterization up with relevant examples.   + What are different ways in which parents instill fear (examples)?   + Are all of them extreme? How do you engage with moderate examples? * I think revenge being taken on the parents is probably a bit too far; I think the worst case scenario would be children avoiding their parents all together? * Try to make sure that you are telling me about why this fear will be abusive; how and why is this the case? Is it because it’s difficult to distinguish between what is abusive and what is not abusive? Try to tell me why this is the case. * Good control of the room re: not taking more than one POI. * Based on the examples provided, like the broccoli monster, it seems a little unclear how that adds to permanent trauma?   + Wouldn't children realize it isn’t true in the long run?   + When you argue that there’s long-term trauma, what does it look like?   + Can you provide interpretation to prove that there will actually be long-term trauma based on the examples brought by both sides in this debate? * Try to make sure that you are structuring your argumentation in the CREI formula; this helps to keep the clarity of the argument intact throughout? * Let’s try to focus on logic as compared to arguing through examples * The point about overthinking every action is a very important one.   + Good examples associated with this thesis!   + You argued that children will learn fear over respect with a fear-mongery approach. The link isn’t direct. You must show how overthinking and trauma will lead to lack of respect..   Speaking time: 06:58.02, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sonja |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THS the use of fear to instill values in children. |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:   * Good work for clarifying that you don't need to be abusive at the start of your speech; try to make sure that you are giving me numerous reasons for why this is true to begin with. Try to explain how and why parents can distinguish. * Try to make sure that you aren’t only focusing on the most convenient and or the easiest part of the OO’s case; try to focus on the harder arguments that kids need a better version of morality comparatively. How do you respond to that? * Good analogy to start the speech. * I think there’s an opportunity to add examples to broaden the scope of what we think ‘fear’ is. It’s a missed opportunity. * You’re taking a super moderate stance. “We’re simply telling them your nintendo taken away” is something that might exist on both sides because of how moderate it is.   + Try providing examples that hit the core of the motion. * The opp side has talked a lot about long-term impacts of fear.   + There is a missing engagement with that interpretation.   + Can we argue how in the long run, fear instilliing childhood is beneficial especially for teaching the right values?   + Can we argue on the level of effectiveness?     - The opp argued how lecture/talking/negotiation works. Can you list out reasons why that is not the case?   + The overall extension, though is brought up in the debate, lacks justification.     - Try incorporating several points to make yourself distinct from all sides. * I’m not so sure why it is the case that it is tough to teach a kid about morality; try to explain why this is the case. Moreover, try to make sure that the difference between you and OG is clear; you can have a segment in the beginning where you explain what the difference between both teams are. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Maddie |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW require defendants in the criminal trials to be exclusively represented by public defendants. |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  Speaking time:   * Nice hook! * Good stage presence; I think that you need to up your hand gestures though as you aren’t giving me enough! * Rebuttals: If you will be rebutting someone in your argumentation, you can go ahead and point out that you will be integrating your rebuttals into your argumentation! * You can try to go further on the idea that people deserve to have representation they choose and support; you could argue that some people really need the best possible defense as they are facing barriers like racism, etc. * Try to switch up your tone and try to make sure that you are incorporating some emotional tones in your speech! * Good use of pacing and structure! * I understand that these people have worked hard and deserve a lot of cash; but try to make sure you really prove that people will not represent the public. You can point out that these lawyers can jump to different fields, etc. * You can also explain that this could prevent people from wanting to become lawyers to begin with or wanting to do criminal law at all; this is terrible as people end up dropping out of criminal law and nobody gets good representation anyway. * You can go further to really bury this point by saying that this is actually a really bad idea because this is going to collapse the public defense system as a whole as this just means more work for the public defenders! * Good control over accepted POIs! * Excellent impacting re: how this contributes to mass incarceration! * Great work in identifying the argument re: how people end up getting worse representation; remember that poorer people suffer the most!   Speaking time: 05:18.42, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kyle |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW require defendants in the criminal trials to be exclusively represented by public defendants. |
| --- |

| 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:  Speaking time:   * Good hook! * Try to make sure that you’re making eye contact; this really helps with your credibility! * Try to make sure that you are actively considering the impact of your rebuttals on the arguments; tell me about how and why your arguments have devastated the other side! * I think that your stage presence was not as great in this speech; it could have been so much better! Try to make sure that you are making eye contact and actively considering the end outcomes of the case. * Try to make sure that you are giving me numerous layers or reasons for why public defenders will end up being joined by the private lawyers! * You could actually go further to talk about how this helps public defenders as people; it could be the case that now public defenders get better treatment and conditions at work which could convince more people to end up becoming public defenders! * Try to make sure that you are structuring and signposting throughout your argumentation. This is gonna really help to make sure that the judge is tracking everything you’re saying! * You could actually argue that most criminal lawyers will be a part of the system; it could be the case that they are passionate about what they do as well, etc!   Speaking time: 03:54.74, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW require defendants in the criminal trials to be exclusively represented by public defendants. |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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: 05:01.99, good work!   * Nice example in the hook! * Good building of context in the beginning of the argument! * I think you had good rhetoric in this speech; but you gotta make sure to couple the rhetoric with your tone! This makes your argument much more compelling and effective. * Try to make sure that you’re making eye contact with the judge! * I think that you want to actually point out that there is a good reason for why private lawyers are a thing; private lawyers contribute to the development of law, best practices, etc. This is a wonderful impact to explore as it shows that people will be impacted by a lack of private criminal lawyers. * You could also point out that people being forced to use public defenders does not mean that public defenders automatically become better; this just means that the public defenders end up in an even worse position than usual! * Try to make sure that you are actively telling me about what the impact may be if people drop out of being a criminal lawyer; does this mean we lose talent away from the legal industry? * You can try to go further on the idea that people deserve to have representation they choose and support; you could argue that some people really need the best possible defense as they are facing barriers like racism, etc. * Try to switch up your tone and try to make sure that you are incorporating some emotional tones in your speech!   Speaking time 04:30.54, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ari |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW require defendants in the criminal trials to be exclusively represented by public defendants. |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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: 05:01.99, good work!   * Nice example in the hook! * Good building of context in the beginning of the argument! * I think you had good rhetoric in this speech; great hand gestures too! * Good signposting! * Good tracking of the other side; you can go further on the argument of workload which is that the government is likely to increase their funding and resources for the public defenders! * You could actually go further to talk about how this helps public defenders as people; it could be the case that now public defenders get better treatment and conditions at work which could convince more people to end up becoming public defenders! * Try to make sure that you are structuring and signposting throughout your argumentation. This is gonna really help to make sure that the judge is tracking everything you’re saying! * Try to make sure that you are talking about why the number of public defenders will increase; since this is what your argument is mainly about, you gotta make sure to fortify this part of the argument! * I like that you were hitting the right aspects of your speech; try to make sure that you are layering all your reasons with at least 3 sub-reasons! * I think there is an assumption in this speech that private lawyers will automatically become a public defender; try to make sure to prove this!   Speaking time: 04:45.16, good work! | | | | | | |