| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  Good opening - what is this flip flop of ideology? Ground this for me by using real life examples; pivot from here into set-up straight. Don’t repeat flip flop again.  Set-up   * Fair on what a technocrat is. What checks or balances exist against them? What happens if they mess up? How do we get rid of them? Who appoints them? * Your framing can’t be you listing everything wrong with the legal system - it has to be why this is the only solution to the issues that exist. We end up arguing too much within set-up on the positives of technocrats - move this into the argument. * Why are we discussing public panic and backlash in set-up? What is the need for this?   Argument 1   * Premise? Thesis? * You need to establish what the nature of electoral politics is; assume that ideological biases and polarisation don’t exist and make this argument on the strongest possible grounds. Then introduce the realities of politics. We’re starting by assuming polarisation and bias exists. * What do we mean by the metric of ideology? Where is the grounding? Where are the examples? * Why are we assuming they will be corrupt? Is corruption the biggest problem in the CJS? You have to characterise what kinds of policies due to the ideological flip flopping exist; what mess do they create? * What is the comparative? The comparative analysis can’t be a whole second argument, it’s analysis needed in **this** argument.   Argument 2   * We need to establish what the distinction between incentives is more systematically. Discuss the incentives of each group and how this impacts their decision-making. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. * Is time the only concern? Why aren’t politicians consistent with regards to time? You have to explain this. * What is the impact of this argument? What kinds of policies do they make? Why are they better?   At 6:30 we jumped to our conclusion, but we hadn’t impacted either argument.  07:05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  Why is objectivity bad? Jump to the good observation on how it needs to be representative; focus on this and flesh this out - why is this a moral question, only those elected can answer to, rather than these appointees. The opening is very bloated. Be more efficient!  Set-up has to come first!  Rebuttal  The summary is too long; you aren’t actually challenging the claim here on politicians changing policies constantly. You counter assert moral values change; is this disproving the claim Matias runs?  What is this nuance? Why does your side achieve this? Why do LGBT rights get accepted in your world? Why would politicians who are representative of presumably conservative people likely make these decisions versus a more progressive academy?  Challenge their model! Who appoints these technocrats? How do you hold them accountable if they mess up?  Set-up  Why do the people matter so much? What is a good policy? You’re not unpacking any of this!  Corruption is untrue? Good on checks or balances that do exist here, but explain why they are sufficient to ensure politicians do not engage in abuse.  What is the time management of this speech? At 5:41, there has been no argument?  Don’t assert democracy as a value! You have to explain why it is valuable to begin with. Why are technocrats not able to represent people as well/what is unique or special about the CJS such that these policies be taken into account!  Why is it likely to be elitist? Explain who these technocrats are, what their backgrounds are likely to be, what kinds of policies they are likely to support - compare it to politicians. This is a pretty vague speech!  The element of criminal justice is near missing from this speech.  07:17 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  This is a vague opening. What do they know, what do they understand? The point you are making is that the way in which this would happen is that the technocrat would be well informed or accountable to politicians etc. This safeguard needs to be spelled out far clearer. Stop saying like as much as you do.  Explain why the citizens are incorrect or misinformed; it is stronger to argue that it isn’t even about the citizens, it is about special interests and lobbyists - this is the influence we seek to remove from politics.  What is the structure of this speech?  Explain why it has to be technocrats systematically; what is distinct about electoral politics that makes it so that even the best politicians are unable to introduce effective CJS policy. Why can’t politicians consult technocrats? Why does it have to be technocrats themselves? Give me examples of the kinds of policies that get passed on your side versus on the other side.  Assume that ideological biases and polarisation don’t exist and make this argument on the strongest possible grounds. Then introduce the realities of politics. We’re starting by assuming polarisation and bias exists.  Why are we assuming they will be corrupt? Is corruption the biggest problem in the CJS? You have to characterise what kinds of policies due to the ideological flip flopping exist; what mess do they create?  What do we mean by society changes? What kinds of changes? Why are they more responsive to change than politicians? Discuss the incentives of each group and how this impacts their decision-making. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking.  06:58  We need to ask POIs. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Nathalie Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  Don’t assert democracy as a value! You have to explain why it is valuable to begin with. Why are technocrats not able to represent people as well/what is unique or special about the CJS such that these policies be taken into account!  Structure needs to be more cohesive; as DLO in BP, have issues/questions or clashes.  On corruption - why are they more prone to this? When will you explain it? Why isn’t it now?  Don’t take a POI in the middle of a sentence!  Why is the current democratic choice good? What kinds of policies are we talking about? You need to ground this and explain what exactly the distinction will be. What policies do you get that the other side doesn’t get? This is so vague and abstract!  Why aren’t they changed as often? Challenge their model - there is no explanation as to who appoints them, how long their terms are, what means of recourse exists, or if there are any checks or balances at all!  You aren’t actually challenging the claim here on politicians changing policies constantly. You counter assert moral values change; is this disproving the claim Matias runs?  Argument 1   * What if the people re-electing them similarly buy into their ideological slants; such as the Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. * Why are the people correct? Or good judges? This is entirely assumed. * Why are majorities correct? * Good on the media - this needs to be unpacked in significantly greater detail!   Explain who these technocrats are, what their backgrounds are likely to be, what kinds of policies they are likely to support - compare it to politicians. This is a pretty vague speech!  The element of criminal justice is near missing from this speech.  07:04 | | | | | | |