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

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to elected representatives. |
| --- |

| 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:  It **could** be biased? They **could** make negative choices? Our burden isn’t to highlight that the possibility of harm exists, it is that it **does** and we need to change this! What does bias even mean? What are these poor choices? This is a very vague problem characterisation.  Set-up   * What is a technocracy? What is a representative democracy? How do we choose these technocrats, and what checks and balances exist? * We have to ensure the way in which we’d implement this is super clear - for instance, objectives based governance, and where this isn’t met - we get rid of them or have performance reviews.   + You could establish clear, measurable, and publicly available metrics to assess the effectiveness of technocratic policies in achieving their stated goals.   + You could conduct regular performance evaluations of technocratic agencies and individuals based on these metrics.   Argument 1   * Why do politicians behave in this way? You need to explain to me what exactly the nature of a politician is, or the kind of election campaigning that occurs.   + For instance, what are the priorities of voters? What kind of issues do they vote on? Is it policies, is it personality, are these voters even informed? * How are technocrats easily called out? * We define what a technocrat is within our first argument, rather than dedicating an entire section to set-up. If we’re unsure what the structure of a first speech should be, please ask me and I’ll walk you through it! * At the end of this argument, what is the impact?   Argument 2   * What is the purpose or change that comes through expertise? What is the value of expertise?   + What are the policies of an elected representative versus a technocrat? This is still unclear at the end of this claim! For instance, technocrats prioritize preventative care and public health initiatives based on epidemiological data, even if these measures are initially unpopular or require significant upfront investment. May advocate for cost-effectiveness analysis and evidence-based treatment protocols. * Give examples of the kind of people who become technocrats. For instance, a welfare economist as head of welfare - you can use the very examples we discussed in class! * At the end of this argument, what is the impact?   We have to spend more time thinking through the analysis in our argument - the claims we’re making at present are too vague, and aren’t being spoken about specifically enough. Our POIs have to be more mindfully worded - they cannot involve summaries of what we said.  05:05 - good work hitting 5! We need to ask POIs consistently - we didn’t ask any today! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to elected representatives. |
| --- |

| 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:  Our opening sounds more confident! What are these checks and balances? And what is this job that we want fulfilled? I need your opening to be more specific. We need to keep up the confident tone throughout, rather than losing heart the moment there is a gap in our notes/thoughts.   * Mark your transitions! When do we move on-to set-up? We needed to explain what we support, and what a representative democracy is!   Rebuttal   * On bias; explain why technocrats have biases; for instance, belief systems that exist in different fields - for instance, certain teaching professionals believing homework does/doesn’t work - there is no such thing as an objectively correct or incorrect policy. It is all contextually determined. * On elected officials being chosen well - explain WHY people choose well; or where they don’t - why this is still okay! For instance, explain how elected officials have access to experts, and use their expertise when making decisions; but that the actual decision must lie in the hands of someone who people choose. * Our burdens must come as a part of set-up, not just at the end of our rebuttals!   Argument 1   * Establish first why there are no checks and balances by the Prop; you can’t assume that this is the panel we talked about in the class - did Prop set this debate up in that way? No! * Can we prove that elected officials will always be better at the job? Is this the same as checks and balances? Stay on track as to what is needed to prove the claim you are making. * The point we need to make is what a representative democracy is, or what the purpose of government is! * Good work considering the elections to stay in power!   Argument 2   * Why are they experts? Why do they cope with stress better? Are they career politicians, who have run for office before, or worked in a law-making capacity? Why is our claim true   We needed to run a principle argument, on the purpose of government! That it is not simply to achieve optimal efficiency or technical solutions. It's to safeguard the rights and well-being of its citizens, promote the common good, and ensure a just and equitable society. This involves balancing competing interests, navigating diverse values, and making decisions that reflect the will of the people. Only elected representatives can do this - not technocrats. Point out the kind of decisions technocrats will make such that they cannot achieve this! For instance, elected reps have to balance the often conflicting interests of various groups within society. A technocrat might recommend cutting funding for arts programs to maximize investment in STEM education, disregarding the cultural value and social benefits of the arts.  If we can speak loudly, as we do when I remind you - why is this not our default volume?  06:08 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to elected representatives. |
| --- |

| 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:  Slow down the opening, we’re speaking too fast! Is passion the tipping point in the round, or is that elections don’t reward merit? We need to explain WHY representative democracy is fundamentally broken. For instance - that it is caught up in ideological wars and tribalism - rather than objective based governance. The way to do this is to highlight the state of the economy, politics and such.  Rebuttal   * What is the value of expertise? We assert this without grounding what it looks like! What kinds of policies are elected officials likely to make, over technocrats - and why are the policies of the latter better? * For instance, on the climate - elected officials might delay action due to economic concerns or political pressure, where technocrats implement carbon pricing based on scientific models and cost-benefit analysis. * We only spent 2 minutes on rebuttal!   Argument 1   * You’re not layering this argument; the way to phrase this is: the first thing I’m going to talk about in this argument is x. * What do people vote on?   + Voters could be misinformed, prioritise short term gains, choose candidates on the basis of party affiliation, be misled etc. * Point out how elections don’t measure competence, and people don’t vote on the basis of competence! We need to make it clear HOW democracies don’t work. * Covid-19 is a good example - explain why they are structurally incentivised to make popular decisions, rather than ones which lead to the most positive change. Why were governments like Singapore and Hong Kong better at dealing with the spread of the virus, over the UK - because the latter failed to take decisive action that would limit mobility - because people would get angry! * We are describing both in throwaway lines, rather than spending time establishing comprehensively the nature of these actors. What are the incentives of these actors? Why do they behave the way they do? What is the need for expertise? The mechanisation is missing!   Give examples of the kind of people who become technocrats. This is a gap in set-up you need to address. For instance, a welfare economist as head of welfare - you can use the very examples we discussed in class! Explain why expertise even matters! What are the policies of an elected representative versus a technocrat? This is still unclear at the end of this claim! For instance, technocrats prioritize preventative care and public health initiatives based on epidemiological data, even if these measures are initially unpopular or require significant upfront investment. May advocate for cost-effectiveness analysis and evidence-based treatment protocols.  YOU NEED TO MODERATE YOUR SPEED. If we just speak very fast, we aren’t letting the judge understand what is important or valuable.  06:01 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to elected representatives. |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our tone at the start was much louder than usual - well done! Good work highlighting how there is no ability to call people out. Explain why this is a bad thing! What kinds of decisions might be made that need to be corrected? Point out that expertise doesn’t mean there is one correct decision! Explain why technocrats have biases; for instance, belief systems that exist in different fields - for instance, certain teaching professionals believing homework does/doesn’t work - there is no such thing as an objectively correct or incorrect policy. It is all contextually determined.  Rebuttal   * Why will technocrats be self-interested, especially compared to elected officials? We are washing out self-interest, but we need to explain WHY elected officials don’t behave in this way! * Explain WHY people choose well; or where they don’t - why this is still okay! For instance, explain how elected officials have access to experts, and use their expertise when making decisions; but that the actual decision must lie in the hands of someone who people choose. * You can also argue that elected officials have access to experts, and can make informed decisions - explain HOW or WHY all elected officials have access to expert views, and have incentives to listen to them - and why it still needs to be those who have been elected who are in the driving seat.   + Point out that elected officials derive their legitimacy from the will of the people. They are accountable to the public through elections and other democratic mechanisms. This ensures that they remain responsive to public concerns and can be removed from office if they fail to meet expectations. * Why are they experts? Why do they cope with stress better? Are they career politicians, who have run for office before, or worked in a law-making capacity? Why is our claim true?   Argument 1   * Why won’t they make decisions that take into consideration what is best for people? What are their ‘own desires’ that you highlight matter more? * We needed to run a principle argument, on the purpose of government! That it is not simply to achieve optimal efficiency or technical solutions. It's to safeguard the rights and well-being of its citizens, promote the common good, and ensure a just and equitable society. * This involves balancing competing interests, navigating diverse values, and making decisions that reflect the will of the people. Only elected representatives can do this - not technocrats. Point out the kind of decisions technocrats will make such that they cannot achieve this!   + For instance, elected reps have to balance the often conflicting interests of various groups within society. A technocrat might recommend cutting funding for arts programs to maximize investment in STEM education, disregarding the cultural value and social benefits of the arts.   05:55 - better volume today!  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |