| **Student Name:** Lilianna Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  We need to speak loudly and clearly. Confidence is a choice - and at present, the judge doesn’t have any incentive to believe in you! I have seen you give proper, loud and clear speeches - please bring this back.  We need to have a hook that explains our stance. If you want to trade off a specific harm or benefit, you can do this through framing - but is that what we are doing right now?  Set-up: we need to establish what the characteristics of centralisation are! For instance, that there is speed and efficiency in decision-making, a clear chain of command, coordinated responses to crises.  We didn’t do any set-up today!  Argument 1   * We need to establish why centralisation is good. If the point is that this isn’t unfair - are these positive reasons? Sure, this leader is elected, but isn’t the legislative as well?   We could have argued that a centralised government makes faster and better decisions, compared to bureaucratic delays and disagreements. For instance, China's rapid COVID-19 response in 2020, where centralized authority enabled swift lockdowns and resource mobilization, was speed what mattered most. We spent class talking about why and when it is justified for the state to limit the representation of people - where was all this?  We need to mitigate against the obvious Opp push that this can lead to a concentration of power, with limited checks and balances; that this is the state overstepping in decision-making because it is not consulting elected representatives in the way that it should.  02:39 - we have to hit a minimum of 4!  We need to ask for, and offer more POIs! How many times did we ask a POI today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Boris Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening, good work highlighting how there is an abuse of power.  Set-up - don’t call it defining the motion   * Good on centralisation being closer to a US presidential election. Good on checks and balances being more prominent in a parliamentary system. * Point out what your stance is - why there is value to separate branches of power in a democratic state.   Rebuttal   * Good call out on the lack of impacting! * On the POI - why is this sacrifice not worth it? When is this sacrifice not worth it? You only assert this, rather than explaining it.   Argument 1   * POI - Trump’s many executive orders are examples of this! * Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so high; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. * How does your side achieve checks and balances? You are giving me the potential for accountability, rather than explaining how your side achieves it. For instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world? * Why and how do the minorities get hurt? Why is there no incentive to cater to them?   We needed to argue the state power principle - and how centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.  I would strongly recommend that you increase the frequency of your speech practice, whether that be at school, at home, or with Capstone in spars. Our confidence is leaving us as the speech progresses. Confidence is a choice - you cannot lose control over your delivery in random bits and pieces - it strongly impacts your persuasive capacity.  05:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shawn Nip |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Give me a proper hook. Signposting is not a hook!  Rebuttal   * Small margin; sure, this leader is elected, but isn’t the legislative as well? If anything, they are more representative, because they take into consideration the opinions of the legislative. You have to explain why representation matters less, compared to the efficiency of making the decision. * Did we engage with the abuse of power argument being made by Opp? We need to explain why centralisation doesn’t mean checks and balances go away! Elections still exist, a free media still exists. * They lose the case because they didn’t respond to the POI? Do you sound reasonable? * We have to fill the set-up gap at first: we need to establish what the characteristics of centralisation are! For instance, that there is speed and efficiency in decision-making, a clear chain of command, coordinated responses to crises.   Argument 1   * Obligation of the head of state - we need to point out that a centralised government makes faster and better decisions, compared to bureaucratic delays and disagreements. For instance, China's rapid COVID-19 response in 2020, where centralized authority enabled swift lockdowns and resource mobilization, was speed what mattered most. We spent class talking about why and when it is justified for the state to limit the representation of people - where was all this? * Why are these the incentives of heads of state? Why are they concerned for instance, by re-election incentive, such that they will not abuse their power? * We need to establish the comparative - which is that there would be bureaucratic delays or disagreements - why are the incentives of different elected representatives not to solve the problem as quickly as possible? * Trump is not the example you should be using! This hurts your case. * The international community is not why heads of state change their behaviour, unless it is a strong country on a weaker one; this is too conditional - the analysis doesn’t check out as to how you achieve your outcome.   The unique impact of centralisation is still unclear.  05:12 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening! Punchy start, with a clear transition to signposting and your stance.  Rebuttal   * Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so high; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. * They can overthrow - how? How does your side achieve checks and balances? You are giving me the potential for accountability, rather than explaining how your side achieves it. For instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world? * POI - your side is more representative! Explain how if this is the metric, your side wins. * Kim Jong Un is a dictator! We’re talking about democracies. You could talk about how centralisation can lead to an erosion of checks and balances, such as Trump - who throws fits that the election was stolen when he was lost, leading to democratic transitions being harder.   We needed to argue the state power principle - and how centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.  Where is our second speaker argument?  We need to offer more POIs!  03:44 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ishan Harishankar |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Focus on clear, simple opening!  Good work having signposting, but the titles are far too long and do not accurately and clearly represent what they are about! We have to clean up our phrasing.  Rebuttal   * On the suppression of rights - the point on freedom/representation is not for you to win. Your side ignores the legislatures and lets the President make decisions; what you need to argue is that the quality of the decision matters more than the process. Explain in what conditions this matters more? * Explain how there are checks and balances on the President, but on representation, you’re fighting a losing battle. * You can also point out why it is unlikely the head of state is just taking every decision on their own; they aren’t a legal or economic or medical expert - it is just that on the decision being chosen, there is less time spent debating it, or arguing with politicians to win over their vote. Politicians vote on legislation on a number of issues, based on their opinions, outside of what they think is good or bad.   Clash 1 - the title is too long, and obscures the point you are trying to make!   * On execution, you need to establish why there are too many people, or why they cannot come to an agreement in time. * We have to make the value of efficiency abundantly clear. Why is efficiency the most important measure for what is a good law, or a good government? Explain how modern threats require rapid responses, that limited government resources demand optimal use, and that visible results maintain public support. * On synthesis - why will the President listen? Why do they have an incentive to do so? * What rights are being suppressed? * We need to establish the comparative - which is that there would be bureaucratic delays or disagreements - why are the incentives of different elected representatives not to solve the problem as quickly as possible?   We need to offer more POIs!  05:26 | | | | | | |