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

| **Motion**: This house would ban plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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 and how is it exploitative? The clincher of the hook is missing, which links the clear harms of this to the thing we want to ban.  Set-up   * I think we want to go into further detail as to when and where plea bargains are used; we’ll talk more about this in oral feedback. The point is you explain how they are used generally badly by aggressive prosecutors, or accepted by underfunded public defenders.   Argument 1   * The thesis and premise of the argument should be spelled out with more clarity. * On the distrust and cynicism - then why would they accept plea bargains? If it is the state extending an offer, why would the person take it? * If they have to go to trial, wouldn’t they be fired already? Plea bargains are only used in criminal trials. * Good reference to public defenders, but we aren’t fully breaking down the way in which plea bargains are used in this context. * Overall, a good explanation of how this targets the poor, but we’re using too much generic analysis and copy pasting rather than making it specific. * Unpack the impact in greater detail - explain why this is what the debate is about; link to purpose of the CJS.   Argument 2   * Why would they (truly guilty people) be offered a plea deal in the first place, or why would prosecutors offer plea deals badly? * We need to characterise this with far more analysis and justification; the impact of no deterrence/less punishment only works if you explain why this context is true.   Impacting needs more work!  06:35  Excellent POIs to Nathalie! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would ban plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:  What is our opening achieving? Explain why this is true! Our opening is flashy without any particular logical push.  Where is the set-up? You have to spend time characterising the nature of a plea deal, when and how they are used, or if there are any regulations your side wants to introduce. You eventually do this, but the justification of the characterisation is still missing.  Rebuttal   * Poor - why are they exclusively used in circumstances of guilt? Why is this characterisation true? Your response is contingent on this being true. * Explain why it is insignificant, or makes up for it. * What do we mean this is the first step to rehab? What if they aren’t guilty? * POI - for the same reasons you claim they are poor or cannot undergo a trial, that is why they cannot…   Argument 1   * Is this someone who stole a friend’s things, or committed a serious crime? A plea deal reduces your sentence for this acceptance. Where is the reduction of sentence analysis coming in? Additionally, they have to be offered this, as opposed to just them deciding they want one. The prosecutor decides when to offer one or not. * Why does the victim automatically get closure when this happens? What do victims want and why? The analysis here is necessary! See the POI Matias asks you. * You need to explain why potentially the rapist would win in court in the CF and make it more painful for the victim. This is needed for your argument to work, but only comes out because of the POI. * I don’t think I should buy this automatic rehab brain implant? You need far more analysis to prove this occurs.   07:04  We have to make sure we ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would ban plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:  This is a good moral claim. Will you follow this up with a principle argument or justification as to why this is true or needs to be the case?  Signposting? What is the structure of this speech?  Rebuttal   * How does your side achieve this outcome? It isn’t enough to challenge that they won’t achieve this, you have to explain why your side does [achieve] it. * You need to analyse why and in which situations prosecutors use plea bargains such that it is unjust, or the guilty get away. * Why would the prosecutor win? What does that mean? * POI - what do we mean it’s not fair? The judge doesn’t give you this offer, the prosecutor does. The differences are accounted for due to differences in cases - it isn’t unfair, it is just contextual. * At the end of your rebuttals you need to stop and tell me what the upshot of all your rebuttals is. What is the key takeaway?   Argument 1  We need to analyse when, where, and in what circumstances plea bargains are offered.  What is new in this argument with regards to the poor, and how they are especially victims of plea bargains? We need to explain systematically why the poor cannot afford experienced private attorneys - they may rely on overworked public defenders who have heavy caseloads and limited time to dedicate to each case. This can lead to inadequate representation and pressure to accept a plea bargain, even if it's not in the defendant's best interest.  What is the impact of this argument? We don’t weigh or impact this at all!  07:17  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:  Good tone up front; we need to explain why this is disproportionately the circumstances in which plea bargains are used. Otherwise, it is easy to frame your contributions out of the debate.  What is the structure of this speech?  Excellent on the poor, and bad representation; explain why this is the best solution in a world of other worse solutions; acknowledge no good or perfect solution for the poor exists.  You need to explain why potentially the rapist would win in court in the CF and make it more painful for the victim. This is needed for your argument to work, but only comes out because of the POI.  You have to spend time characterising the nature of a plea deal, when and how they are used, or if there are any regulations your side wants to introduce. You eventually do this, but the justification of the characterisation is still missing.  Poor - why are they exclusively used in circumstances of guilt? Why is this characterisation true? Your response is contingent on this being true.  Is this someone who stole a friend’s things, or committed a serious crime? A plea deal reduces your sentence for this acceptance. Where is the reduction of sentence analysis coming in? Additionally, they have to be offered this, as opposed to just them deciding they want one. The prosecutor decides when to offer one or not.  Extension   * Why does the victim automatically get closure when this happens? What do victims want and why? The analysis here is necessary! * Good work considering the purpose of criminal cases; but why are we confident or assured it would be higher - i.e. the criminal’s sentence? * Do you think you prove this outcome?   07:09 | | | | | | |