| **Student Name:** Jennie Jung |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good job with the hook and signposting!  I appreciate your reinforcement on why their system will fail.   * However, Prop has already argued that the system is failing to begin with. So how is your version any better? * We need to attack their model a lot more! Explain to me why the state will not have the funds to fund this system.   + 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 unique special needs that clients may have and other uses of high-merit lawyers, Prop’s main response is that poor people can never have access to this privilege due to their lack of funding.   * 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.   Well done by bringing up that pro-bono lawyers exist for the poor!   * But there is no analysis on why these high-quality 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.   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.   Where are the rest of your rebuttals on wealth inequality and poor access to the right of self-defense? We are doing well in reinforcing where we’re strong, but we also need to respond on where we are weakest!  Please offer more POIs! Accept POIs as well!  5.05 | | | | | | |