| **Student Name:** Louca |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * Nice tone and start to the speech! Good hook as well. * Style: The speech is very easy to follow through, primarily because of clear use of language and good pace of speech. * Process of hiring: 25-30%, try to also talk about how long you will take to do this - will you be doing this over a period of many years or is it a short-term effort? * Nice focus and explanation on why trust is important in the police. A more effective argument here could be about why police officers might systematically discriminate against minorities because of things like minorities living in high crime areas, etc. * In connection with the argument above, you gotta make sure to start impacting there and then as to why you GAIN trust and how that trust will be used. For gaining the trust, it could be because the minorities feel more secure, more safe, comfortable, etc when they have a familiar face to turn to. For what the trust will be used for, you could go ahead and explain that this could result in more cases being investigated, etc. * There is a hint of a strong perspective on what argument should be prioritized over which. However, the first argument about ‘trust’ could have more illustrations. The example of George Floyd was good, however, there could be either more explanation to the example, or simply more examples to further illustrate the thesis. * Good answer to the POI; you can also go further with the response and try to explain there and then that racism requires you to not see the other as human - perhaps when these racist officers see a fellow cop who is a minority, maybe they are more likely to soften up and change their minds. * On the level of ‘impact’, technical explanations seem to be limited. For example: how will people respond, how will marginalized groups view the police, why will this be a technical solution to the problem of lack of trust, lack of reporting, or how will it simply reduce bad arrests/improve police fairness? |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Ethan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * Nice start to the speech; I like the volume and tone you were able to keep up. Try to maintain that volume throughout the rest of your speech! * The speech would benefit from more time spent on the first rebuttal (as well as building more context before entering the rebuttal). The rebuttal did not provide an overall response to the substantiation brought by the first proposition. * Rebuttal: 1. Gun violence decreases - I understand that correlation does not lead to causation; but you gotta go a lot further than just this to rebut the idea! You need to provide at least 1-2 lines of rebuttal here to tackle the argument. * Most of your argument relies on showing that the minorities will not be qualified for the job; this is an assumption though. You gotta make sure that you show why we are likely to reduce standards to hire these minorities - could it be because the pool to pick from is very small? Could it be because minorities don’t want to join the force? * There are several areas that can be covered in the first opposition speech. The current line of arguments, though are highly relevant, their explanations have been quite limiting. Other thematic ideas could include: how people would view the police? Does this overall improve police efficiency? Does this approach harm minorities in general, or the way in which society views them? Is there a long-term harm that can be argued upon? * The argument about discrimination within and outside the force could be more expanded upon; for instance, you could first talk about how the officers from within the force may not be taken seriously. Secondly, you could also talk about how we make minorities the face of the police; even when the institution can be very bad for the common person! * Good argument about racism; try to impact this though. Could this result in a much larger eventual policy/societal backlash? What could that look like?   Speaking time: 04:45.84, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Amanda |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * Nice hook! You don’t need to keep saying coloured though. People of colour are much more politically correct! Try to also make sure that you don’t let your opponents throw you off from base; you gotta keep firm and straight despite the other people in the classroom! * Style: Very good approach in terms of mannerisms (commanding start, good eye contact.) * Rebuttal: 1. Representation - You can also point out that 80% of the force is still very much open to everyone; this likely means that the majority of the force is likely to be pretty white anyway. Beyond that though, you want to make sure to directly deal with the reason given by the other side. The other side basically said that some people would get rejected and would therefore be resentful; you could try to rebut this by talking about how there are other opportunities and also at the same time, there are other departments! * The token rebuttal wasn’t it; the reason for this is because you can just go ahead and say that the current force is not represented the way it is due to merit - but a lack of attempts to get other people into the force. * Good signposting! * There is a hint of a good understanding of identifying disputes and clashes. There are also good attempts to illustrate the arguments/responses well. This could be well noticed in the argument/response on the subject of Tokenism. A little more technical approach to the opinion would be beneficial. This can be achieved with multiple broad examples attached to the opinion. * I like the idea that we are going to correct historical wrongs; but make sure that you are proving to me that the minorities will actually change things for the better! * The argumentation about role models is pretty good; make sure to talk about what the impact of this is though. Does it mean that we at the very least open up a pathway for people to become a lot more qualified and professional in the future? * The POI could have been dealt better in the first attempt. A simple argument could be: it in fact encourages minorities to finally apply for police departments, and provides a better opportunity to the privileged class in police to understand the nuances of communities different from theirs. |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Anders |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * Most of your argument relies on showing that the minorities will not be qualified for the job; this is an assumption though. You gotta make sure that you show why we are likely to reduce standards to hire these minorities - could it be because the pool to pick from is very small? Could it be because minorities don’t want to join the force? * Good hook and good start to the argument! * There are many good efforts in identifying the arguments/opinions made by the proposition, and directly rebutting them. The clarity is appreciated. * I like the talk about high pressure jobs; you can extend this to talk about how this move places minorities in harm's way. The reason for this is because they could be unprepared and unable to take on the major stress of being an officer. * Will quotas solve the problem: You can go further here to talk about certain systematic problems, like qualified immunity, and or the way they are trained? * Try to make sure to make your rebuttals sound like you are dunking on your opponents arguments as compared to the person itself; you were getting a little close to the line there with the responses towards prop 1! * The extension of the team’s points included technical elaboration of the impact as well. Good job. Try adding unique points in higher numbers. The idea of ‘police trust’ has been extended to a degree, but can have several points of harms attached to them. * Time management was an issue in this speech; you only entered the argument at 4:00 minutes! * Try to make sure that you talk about how this distrust will occur; I understand why it is possible, but try to give me the step by step process of how things get as bad as you suggest they will. * ‘Distrustful towards police’ and ‘police viewed in negative light’ and therefore people ‘losing faith’ towards the police has been somewhat repetitive. Either add unique points within, or start a new argument to avoid repetition. |
| --- |

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

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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 start and hook to the case! Good eye contact and stage presence as well. * There is a good hint of sophistication and nuances, which is appreciated. This is visible from the very start. * Rebuttal: 1. Tokenism; I understand what you are saying when you are saying that the current force is tokenistic because of the way the police force has been constructed. But a better response would be: * I feel that you indirectly/subtly conceded that there is a massive compromise in merit on the prop’s end. You could argue how that’s not the case, as its largely meritocratic to fight biases in the hiring process, and ones that get selected definitely have to outperform their competitors to get in. So while there may be some compromise on a macro level, on the micro, there’s just more fairness. * That the minority police officers will be qualified; it doesn’t make sense for a police force to just hire people with no real qualifications! They will not do this. It's quite likely that the force will train people or find people from across the country.   + That the minority police officers will be respected; you can use the angle of brotherhood and camaraderie amongst police officers. You can argue that look, people are likely to respect their police colleagues as they are their partners. * Try to also make sure that you are actively telling me why their steps are not very effective (E.g., fixing structural issues.) The reason for this is because it is much more difficult to fix these issues compared to fixing the diversity problem. You could also say that minorities are much more likely to fix these problems compared to a non-diverse force!   Speaking time: 05:19.59, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Luke |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**  Speaking time: 04:08.16, good work!   * The clarity of speech is good. * Most of your argument relies on showing that the minorities will not be qualified for the job; this is an assumption though. You gotta make sure that you show why we are likely to reduce standards to hire these minorities - could it be because the pool to pick from is very small? Could it be because minorities don’t want to join the force? * Good stage presence and hand gestures! * There is also another angle that you can consider in this debate; which is that minorities will become the face of the police force and used to shield the police from criticism. This could be because the police force always points to the fact that they have minorities in the force despite actions against minorities, etc. * I think more effort needs to be put into proving that people are going to believe that these officers are not competent; could it be because of existing racial narratives, fake news, misinformation, etc? Try to give yourself some padding or grounding to show that your argumentation has a potential to happen/be realistic. * Try to tell me about how the bias becomes worse perhaps; could it be because people now feel like they have a cover or excuse to be discriminatory? * There seems to be an assumption that lies on the extreme, i.e., on prop, the police does not know how to police as people that are selected lack competence Entirely. It is recommended that you respond to a more moderate/reasonable understanding of the prop’s case, i.e., there may be minor compromises on competence, however, its necessary to fight prejudice/stereotyping against minorities. The later half of the speech seems more corrected in regards to this point, so good job there. * The subject of ‘trust’ and how people view the police seems to experience a level of stagnation, as it isn’t being clashed in a way that takes the debate ‘forward’. This can be resolved by using unique examples and finding different ways to diagnose/identify the prop’s weaknesses, though keeping in mind that new arguments aren’t recommended at this point. |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Ethan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During times of emergencies, THW censor all information that endangers national security. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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! I like the way you zoomed into how this is about national security and crisis specifically. Try to make sure that you first tell me about why this context identification is super important! * Rebuttals; good identification of the other side - but try to make sure to compare the levels of panic between both sides. Both sides probably have some level of panic, but why is yours a lot better comparatively? * You want to make sure to identify why exactly it is the case that the clash identified is the most important one; try to also make sure that you are fist framing and telling me why it is the case that your argumentation is the most important and impactful first to begin with! * You can tell me a few reasons for why the government may not abuse its power; it could be because the government is still subjected to political considerations, etc. This will hurt their ability to get votes in the next election! * Try to also tell me why the government has the incentive to respond to negative allegations against them; this is because of a high level incident (E.g., a confrontation between authorities and citizens) occurs, the government understands that this could spread due to social media, etc. This makes it likely for the government to keep things transparent and clear! * Good hand gestures and pacing! * Try to make sure that you are actively comparing your side and theirs with two elements; truth and impacts. In general, you should attempt to prove that you are more truthful and more impactful than the other side! Bring up the specific things said and compare from there. * I wasn’t too sure about the anarchist angle; try to tell me why this is reasonable and likely first! * Try to switch up your tone and emphasis; you could do with a tone that is sharper and more assertive!   Speaking time: 05:00.05, good work! |
| --- |