| **Student Name:** Dana Chung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH prefers a world where technocrats ran the government, compared to elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  In the hook, we’re focused on broad descriptions of what the status quo is, it would be more effective if it double-hats as a way to highlight the worst case scenarios. So you can start with a very high impact on top of adding clarity.  On the set-up:   * Well done with the mechanism of selecting the technocrats, the impeachment system, it was clear and strategic. * In terms of execution, try to re-package everything into 3 levels, and use clear transition points. Keep it succinct, so you don’t have to explain WHY you proposed the mechanism, we can leave this to the mechanisation analysis later on. We can limit set-up to just the actions you support. * We’re still lacking a burden/winning pathway!   On the first argument:   * Good starting point on the knowledge and expertise gap that politicians suffer from, don’t just stop here. Explain what KIND of politicians are typically successful, it’s often the charismatic demagogues who have terrible policy backgrounds get elected.   + We need to analyse why exactly voters are so incapable in a democracy that they tend to elect under-qualified, ‘idiotic’ representatives. Characterise their emotional psyche and why they tend to rally behind politicians who take advantage of their vulnerable state of anger and fear.   + We can take this grounding further to explain what kind of public policy will be disastrous if they are guided by biased ideologies, instead of facts.     - E.g. We see this happen with economic policies. The biased capitalists elected in the US government allowed the deregulation of the financial industry, which led to the massive 2008 global financial crisis. * Well done utilising the Anthony Fauci example to show that politicians deliberately ignore the advice of experts in the status quo.   + Don’t stop here, explain the reasoning as to WHY politicians will prioritise their moral beliefs over objective facts. Point out here why voters and politicians will never listen to data, and instead prioritise these popular biases. Because the popular biases make them more electable, and they are only interested in their preservation of power. * The impacting is in the right direction in terms of harming public interest.   + But we need to illustrate the human costs here. What exactly is the ability of public policies to create massive human costs? What does the suffering of the people look like?   On the second argument:   * On the concentration of power towards the executives, we’re arguing in a vacuum while neglecting the rest of the democratic structure such as the legislative and the judiciary.   + After this, we need to explain why you think if there is a concentration of power, abuse of power typically follows, then what is the impact statement of that. * In fact, in a comparative, the technocrats will have a greater concentration of power in contrast to the separation of powers structure that are inherent in democracies.   Good job offering POIs today!   * Try to avoid asking open-ended questions that can be easily answered by your opponents. It’s almost like you’re offering them a lifeline to further prove their points. * You can also ASK for a POI from your opponent right at the sixth minute mark.   7.12 | | | | | | |