| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **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.]  Love the rhetoric in the hook, use some illustrations as well to drive the point home.  Good attack on Proposition’s model of still being able to use money to compete for the best public defenders.   * Conclude clearly how this model actively contradicts ALL of their principle arguments.   I appreciate the pushback that Prop is just forcing everyone under a failed system.   * Can we explain why that is preferable vs a system where only poor people are forced to go through a failing system? * We still need some mechanistic analysis as to why the state will not financially survive the expansion to include every single public defender.   Rather than just rhetorically stating who will run these cases on Prop, break down the incentives of lawyers to all leave the criminal law field.   * Prop stated that many lawyers still have passion in their field, so explain why this will apply minimally. And they will be even more overworked than before.   Good job reinforcing the point on private lawyers being able spearhead specific changes.   * But there is no analysis on why these high-merit lawyers have the right incentive to improve things like pro-bono representation of minorities and social movements, or contribute to the academic enrichment of the community.   A lot of our analysis on public defenders lacking wealth and motivation is exactly the same as 1st Prop. Are you not just defending their problem statement? It entrenches the problem in the status quo, what will the Opposition do to address this?   * We need to explain that while poor people have limited access, this is an argument to improve the quality of public defenders by increasing state funding.   + Prop will have a better chance of fixing the system by funding a small pool of people, not the entire pool of criminal lawyers.   While we are decreasing the number of people who have access to quality legal services, Prop is arguing that there’s something extremely immoral about only poor people being excluded.   * Can you engage with their idea of justice, instead of retreating back towards your preferred metric on scale?   The angle seems to be “more harm than good,” while your Prop is asking for a solution.   * So spend some time on the strategy explaining why your burden is not to prove solvency, but to show that things can be a lot worse instead.   Please offer more POIs! Accept POIs as well!  5.24 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |