| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Well done on the call-out at the top of their speech!   * After pointing out that poor people are the ones with no choices at all, can we explain why it is still preferable to have everyone under a failing system?   + Because 2nd Opp has argued reducing the scale of harm is intuitive, we have to push forward with why persecuting the poor is uniquely morally abhorrent.     - E.g. Point out how racial minorities get targeted by the police, and they need a good defense to not be pushed into the cycle of incarceration.     - E.g. We need to explain how bad lawyers force minorities into false plea deals of guilt when they are actually innocent.   On your system giving them an incentive to work, it isn’t clear why the per-case payment by capable people will rival the amount they could earn in Opp’s world.   * If the fee is so significant, then it will be exactly the same as the private market.   Instead of using the extra-fee model, mechanise your model by stating:   * 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.   While it’s true that the right to self-defend is compromised, it isn’t clear how you’re not just expanding this harm to every person in the system since everyone will now suffer from this system!   * We need to point out why the miscarriage of justice is completely contradictory to the larger goal of the criminal justice system.   This speech is lacking proper impact statements, although we did well on vague statements of injustice.   * On rich people getting away with crimes, 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 poor people suffering from bad defense, explain how they are the majority who suffer from mass incarceration and get trapped into a cycle of crime.   As the third speaker, we also have to reinforce every argument of your teammate.   * We dropped the argument on distrust of the justice system.   Please offer even more POIs!  5.09 | | | | | | |