| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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:  We have to FRAME why executive pardons are used in the case of special interests, and why they will always be. We have to establish why the **potential for abuse will always exist - and how this undermines public trust in the justice system.**  Set-up   * What kinds of actions would we support instead? How do we want decisions to be arbitrated? * Why is this distinct from other checks and balances that may also be susceptible to influence by polarisation or special interests?   Argument 1   * Why are we spending so much time on the headmaster analogy? We need to analyse the following!   + The pardon power can be easily manipulated for political gain, allowing executives to shield allies from prosecution, obstruct justice, or reward political favors. This politicization undermines the principle of equal justice under the law and erodes public confidence in the impartiality of the legal system.   + The perception, even if unfounded, that pardons are granted based on political connections rather than merit, significantly damages the integrity of the justice system. * POI - we have to explain what the process of justice, under the court system is, that is far more accountable and transparent, compared to the pardon process - which is shrouded in secrecy, with decisions made without clear justification or public input.   04:33 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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: | NA (on request) | | | | | |
| 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 are you talking about? Why would they be swayed?  Set-up   * What bad decisions? We have to establish what the context for this is!   Rebuttal   * What is the process through which executive pardons are decided? Please tell me more.   Argument 1   * How do they use it in check; don’t talk about this happening hypothetically but rather explain to me what incentives exist for presidents to use it with reason. * POI - this asks you to explain the process too! * Why is this a unique fix to the problems you are describing? Why is it that no other function in the government can create this check and balance? * You don’t have to defend the Biden pardon, but either mitigate it and explain why it doesn’t matter, or why this was entirely politicised?   What did we prove in this speech?  04:30  You need to explain why this is a figure with moral and political authority; why it is a legitimate decision by someone who has vested power by the people! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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: | NA (on request) | | | | | |
| 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 have to FRAME why executive pardons are used in the case of special interests, and why they will always be. We have to establish why the **potential for abuse will always exist - and how this undermines public trust in the justice system.**  We need to analyse further why this individual not being a random person and the highest authority in the land engaging in this behaviour sets a bad precedent, with regards to certain individuals or crimes being above reproach; you cite the Trump cases and special interest, but we need to characterise this as bipartisan - that Obama did it, that Clinton did it too.  What system of justice do we prefer instead? Why would the judiciary behave in a perfectly reasonable manner?  Consider how judges are appointed/elected - and how technically, there are already relevant checks and balances in this regard. What do we MEAN by the branches having their own logical sense?  05:04 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening! Why is redemption uniquely linked to a pardon? Why are there no other ways in which this can occur?  Rebuttal   * Why are they generally not high profile? * What has happened such that they have been given harsh sentences, or incorrect sentences? * Good on potential deterrence existing - analyse re-election incentive, or potential reforms your side might support instead of complete abolishment? * On monitoring - why is this unique?   + POI - we need to explain how the federal nature of the US means that individual states can be generally far more extreme, for instance, putting people on the death penalty / capital punishment - and that a more liberal president can act as a check against this. * Insufficient mitigation on Trump and Biden; explain why this isn’t setting a bad precedent. * How is the judiciary likely to be ‘bad’ or ‘corrupt’?   Extension   * How is this distinct from the rebuttal?   We need to spend more time explicitly engaging with OG such to make sure we are clearly winning top half.  We need to prove why the judiciary makes the wrong decisions in the first place!  05:20 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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, spend less time on rhetorical flourishes with regards to justice, and instead more on how this undermines legitimacy.  You need to establish what the opening clash in the round is, and why it is fundamentally missing the mark - so do set-up in this context, rather than literally as a contribution - you’re technically not allowed to engage in set-up in BP.  We need to be more efficient / machine-gun like with our responses - this is a five minute speech. Explicitly explain why OO is out of the debate.  Extension I  When you engage in a vertical extension, spell out exactly what is new about the content you are providing, and how you take it above your opening team.  Good work explaining how exactly the system of courts work - explain why these are professionals, why there are multiple checks and balances in relation to sentencing. Why are judges, specifically, good at their job?  Good on how politicians are likely to behave in bad ways; explain why this undermining is bad. What is the impact of this?  Consider how judges are appointed/elected - and how technically, there are already relevant checks and balances in this regard. What do we MEAN by the branches having their own logical sense?  Extension II  Why are they entirely ideologically inclined? First establish how the US is fundamentally polarised, such that this becomes a problem.  Weighing needs to be more explicit! We just repeat the extension, say we provided analysis - this isn’t weighing!  We need to analyse further why this individual not being a random person and the highest authority in the land engaging in this behaviour sets a bad precedent, with regards to certain individuals or crimes being above reproach; you cite the Trump cases and special interest, but we need to characterise this as bipartisan - that Obama did it, that Clinton did it too.  05:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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 work establishing what the back and forth is; don’t dismiss special interests by claiming no analysis existed, or that this is a minority of cases, establish why it is out of place instead. Go beyond the deterrence claim that your OO runs.  Identify the gap in the debate, and how your extension fills it BEFORE you make it, so the judge is already aware as to what the value of it will be.  On attention - what does this change? What does scrutiny lead to? What does the lack of scrutiny elsewhere lead to? The same applies to a changing society - what or how are these systems flawed? Engage with the courts process analysis Matias provided. For instance, that judges (state) are elected - and hence likely to pander, appear tough on crime.  Supreme Court Justices aren’t involved in murder cases, or criminal cases that are generally under sentence reduction or pardons per this case.  Why is redemption uniquely linked to a pardon? Why are there no other ways in which this can occur?  What has happened such that they have been given harsh sentences, or incorrect sentences? We need to explain how the federal nature of the US means that individual states can be generally far more extreme, for instance, putting people on the death penalty / capital punishment - and that a more liberal president can act as a check against this. Even if we discount politicisation, we can argue that courts apply the law strictly based on legal statutes and binding precedents, and as such have limited ability to deviate from mandatory sentencing guidelines or established jurisprudence. When extenuating circumstances are overlooked—or if post-trial revelations indicate a miscarriage of justice—the pardon power provides a fail-safe mechanism.  05:20 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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:  I want a content oriented opening, not this general statement that your side is most logical. Demonstrate this to me instead!  On OO:   * You need to explain why the judiciary doesn’t make bad decisions in the first place; and then insert your partner’s extension - you have to use it to explain how your side wins above the other team here. This should also be the response to the POI. * Good on whether they look into it or not; explain why there is a dis-incentive to do this. * We also have to explain why people will do this in generally bad ways - analyse this in greater detail compared to OG, and then you can weigh your contribution above it. * Was this sufficient response to OO? You need to engage with their mitigation on reputation creating a deterrent to bad decisions.   On CO:   * Don’t take a POI from OO during this! Don’t take more than one POI in a 5 minute speech? * What was our response to CO?   We took FOUR POIS!  Don’t whip the extension in a vacuum, it has to be used against the other teams.  On OG:   * Don’t REBUT them, explain what their contributions were, pinpoint either an analytical gap and explain how you fill it and it is valuable in the round.   04:58 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jeffrey Shen |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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; it doesn’t necessarily knife it, but it allows you to explain why moneyed interests or special interests also exist in the judicial system - deal with this up top and then move on. This isn’t done through an explanation on the Supreme Court, which is less relevant in relation to amnesties, or reduction of sentences, but that judges are either appointed, or elected, and that there is significant politicisation in this process.  CG: On reputation and legitimacy: we have insufficient mitigation here; we need to analyse why scrutiny is so extreme such that it means rather than bad precedents being set, this sets a deterrent instead. Go beyond the analysis from OO here and weigh up against them.  OG: Good simple responses on drugs/precedent with regards to harms. We should challenge the analytical gaps here first; you need to call them out for lack of analysis, then engage in good faith, and then weigh first on argument quality, then outcome.  CG again: Why is redemption uniquely linked to a pardon? Why are there no other ways in which this can occur?  What has happened such that they have been given harsh sentences, or incorrect sentences? We need to explain how the federal nature of the US means that individual states can be generally far more extreme, for instance, putting people on the death penalty / capital punishment - and that a more liberal president can act as a check against this. Even if we discount politicisation, we can argue that courts apply the law strictly based on legal statutes and binding precedents, and as such have limited ability to deviate from mandatory sentencing guidelines or established jurisprudence. When extenuating circumstances are overlooked—or if post-trial revelations indicate a miscarriage of justice—the pardon power provides a fail-safe mechanism.  With each house, following responses, you need to establish what the comparative is on your side, and how your partner’s extension deals with them; weigh the contribution and then move onto the next house.  05:17 | | | | | | |