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

| **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: | 67 | | | | | |
| 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.]  I really like that we’re using real examples to prove your point, but what actually happened in that case? Explain more uniquely the vital role of that private lawyer.  We didn’t propose any counter set-up!   * Explain what is the Opp comparative you support, how do you mitigate the harms of the status quo? * What is your winning pathway?   Good rebuttal that there will be an exodus of good lawyers, explain that this job is highly stressful and difficult, so high wages is what justifies the role.   * We did not analyse why the state will be so overburdened and would not be able to sustain this system if they have to pay every criminal lawyer.   Where are the rest of your rebuttals on wealth inequality and poor access to the right of self-defense?   * The rule of thumb is one rebuttal for one argument.   Point out 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.   On the first argument:   * While I appreciate the premise on the importance of choice, Prop is highlighting that poor people don’t have access to the same choices. Why are we okay with that? * 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.   On the second argument:   * Good claim on private lawyers having the capacity to spearhead specific changes.   + But there is no analysis on why these rich 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.   Ethan, this is reading very much like a ChatGPT speech. No engagement, no debate strategy, just reading off of a page. Please apply yourself based on the debate that is happening in front of you.  Please offer more POIs!  4.41 - Do not speak undertime, wait for the 5th minute. | | | | | | |