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

| **Motion**: This house 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:  Put the benefit/outcome of a fairer criminal justice system first, rather than repeating the entire motion.  Clear signposting! Let’s speak louder here please.  Set-up   * Good work establishing what the problem in this debate is, in terms of the differences between private and public defenders; we should definitely explain why this difference exists - is it because of funding, is it because of training, what is the reason? We need to understand WHY they are worse to make sure we solve the problem in full! * Are we going to pump money into public defenders? * At present, this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - is this the same system we’re now extending further?   Argument 1   * Clear harm to the poor being established; we need to establish this more structurally! * Good work pinpointing you need to explain structurally why they are worse - clear on lack of pay and long hours; we should explain this in greater detail!   + Private lawyers have smaller caseloads, more time - which all leads to a more thorough investigation, more extensive legal research, and more time to prepare for trial.   + They can also be more aggressive - they could file motions to suppress evidence, challenging the prosecution's case more vigorously, and take cases to trial more often. * You need to explain how this distinction and advantage goes away to create a better and fairer system. * On the same lawyer to all - explain why this version of justice is fair and legitimate. * On the threat to safety - we need to explain this in greater detail! Explain who gets free and gets away, and what harms [to] the public this creates. Does it reduce trust in the system? Do they feel alienated and let down by the state? The impact of this argument isn’t being explained!   Argument 2   * What is the thesis of this argument? It is unclear up top what you’re trying to prove here? Is this just analysis as to why public defenders are competent, and if so - shouldn’t that go in the first argument?   We can also run a principle on why it’s justified to limit people spending the money they worked hard to earn; why the system being fair matters more than the quality of the trial here. For instance, that we need to ensure a baseline level of competent representation for everyone; and that public trust in the judiciary matters more than the autonomy of people in this case.  06:08  Let’s make sure to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 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:  Why will it make it unjust? We need to make sure our opening highlights the central issue - which is that the current system is too overloaded; highlight very clearly what your stance is here; which is that we need to uplift those who suffer, not drag everyone down together.  Set-up   * Only private? No public defenders? I’m slightly confused as to what your side wants here. * Is this a debate about which type of lawyer is better, or the current issues with the CJS, and whether forcing public defenders on everyone is a good idea? * Does our set-up engage with the harm accruing to the poor on Prop at all? * We needed to explain that we will let people use private defenders, but pump funding into public defense/make private lawyers more accessible to the poor; through subsidies, or even policies. For instance, we could mandate lower caseload limits for public defenders, we could provide public defender offices with dedicated investigative resources, including investigators, forensic experts, and other specialists   Rebuttal   * If we want to argue that there will be a miscarriage of justice, we need to explain why this miscarriage matters more than the miscarriage Prop points out, on the poor. * We kind of just assert that some people will lose out, and might be seen as guilty even though they aren’t because their lawyers are bad - but this happens already anyways! * How do we deal with Prop’s problem characterisation?   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What outcome are we trying to prove? * This isn’t comparative - the same comment as to the miscarriage of justice applies here. How do the poor access private defense attorneys on your side?   We needed to explain why there is a moral right to spend money in the ways people want! The money individuals earn is the product of their labor and effort; this is the fruit of their labour - they have a fundamental moral right to control and dispose of their earnings as they see fit, including spending it on goods and services they deem essential, such as legal representation. Ask if this will ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; or will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?  06:06  We need to pay attention to our flow + volume!  We have to ask POIs! Where are the consistent POIs? | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 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:  The first call out must be to the lack of counterfactual + engagement from Opp - where their take is that everyone should use private defense attorneys, because otherwise there are miscarriages of justice. They also don’t engage on the harm to the poor.  Rebuttal   * Explain why they work hard - they went into this field of law specifically knowing they wouldn’t be paid - it’s that they literally don’t have time to work the number of cases that they have. The point is that they get ignored because the wealthy don’t use them! The poor aren’t a pertinent voting demographic, hence, politicians don’t pander to them. We lack the tax money to increase budgets, because this isn’t seen as an issue to the extent that the wealthy basically buy their way out - we invest them into the system when it suddenly hurts them. **The mechanism to correct the system + making it robust is missing.** * On data and analytics - is this exclusive to your side? * Is it the case that private defense attorneys are bad? Does this stand given your first speaker explained systematically how they are better, and hence access to them means that the wealthy win when they shouldn’t, and the poor lose when they shouldn’t?   Argument 1   * Was there any explanation on how resources to the public defense system increase at first? We assert there will be more resources - but the explanation as to what this, and how it gets done is missing! * Why are public defenders better? What experience do they have that makes them better? The explanation is missing, even though I don’t think this is the most strategic claim to make.   We could have explained why it’s justified to limit people spending the money they worked hard to earn; why the system being fair matters more than the quality of the trial here. For instance, that we need to ensure a baseline level of competent representation for everyone; and that public trust in the judiciary matters more than the autonomy of people in this case.  06:30 - we can’t go above 6:15!  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  We need to have a hook!  Rebuttal   * What does this call out do? What is it achieving? ‘Shift the basis of their case’ doesn’t actually mean? * There is case tension - first says private lawyers are better, second says they don’t? The point is that they could be good, but they can’t be because they’re stretched thin. The solution must be to uplift them, and make private defense attorneys more accessible to the poor/working class etc. There’s no set-up from first, so we need to fill this gap!   + They never engage with the increasing burden being put on public defenders - this is what is important for you to call out up top!   + For instance, we could mandate lower caseload limits for public defenders, we could provide public defender offices with dedicated investigative resources, including investigators, forensic experts, and other specialists * Good intuition pump on differences between public and private in other sectors.   We needed to spend more time on rebuttal; as 2nd Opp you can’t just start your argument at 2 minutes!  Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim in this argument? You’ve started on analysis without explaining to me what’s going on. * I think the point to make is that the public defenders' lives are getting worse without reprieve; they went into this area of law to do good, but if they get churned out in this fashion - they will just leave. The other side provided no mechanism as to how things get better. * Impact and explain how it isn’t just the wealthy that suffer, but also the poor; you have to explain what the purpose of the CJS is - and if it is to ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; will it lead to a miscarriage of justice? * POI - what are these systems? Did they ever explain this? * I still don’t know how your side helps the poor! What mechanism to their uplift do we get on your side?   We needed to explain why there is a moral right to spend money in the ways people want! The money individuals earn is the product of their labor and effort; this is the fruit of their labour - they have a fundamental moral right to control and dispose of their earnings as they see fit, including spending it on goods and services they deem essential, such as legal representation.  Excellent work asking POIs today!  05:54 | | | | | | |