| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This would require defendants in criminal trials to be represented exclusively by public defenders |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  The hook could be more high impact!  Well done with the first rebuttal pointing out that poor people are the ones with no choices at all, and denied meaningful representation for important cases.   * We can also use this to take down their 2nd argument, which is that rich lawyers have no incentive to apply themselves in this way and provide pro-bono work for social movements. * We need to then proceed to the comparative, why is it still not better for Opp to say that on a scale, less people not accessing high-quality legal services is still preferable.   We did not engage with Opp’s point that good lawyers will always leave the field!   * We can suggest that the state will have more incentives to fund the system if every rich and powerful person’s rights are also affected. * We can also suggest that many criminal lawyers want to stay in the field due to their passion.   It’s unclear how the example of Jeffrey Epstein is to your favour!   * Presumably, you should still want good lawyers for everyone in your system, so Epstein will still get a meaningful defense. * Are you then conceding that everyone is getting a bad lawyer in your world?   + We never had a coherent defense on how your system will survive with the lack of funding!   When it comes to big tech companies, then they will still have massive leverage over the politicians.   * On rich people getting away with their crimes by paying fines, we need to expand the impact statement to society! What harms will they suffer as a result? * Now expand this to a culture of crime and explain that the rich are often the ones who abuse the most laws in society and they are never held accountable.   On the distrust of the system is analysed too vaguely, it isn’t clear that this was the main culprit behind that problem. Is this not caused by racism in policing instead?  Please offer more POIs!  5.19 | | | | | | |