| **Student Name:** Sonja Chow |
| --- |

| **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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  **Potentially** destroy; **could** vote for the wrong person? Our burden isn’t to highlight that the possibility of harm exists, it is that it **does** and we need to change this! This is a very vague problem characterisation.  Our signposting should only cover set-up, the title of our arguments, and that’s it! You don’t have to say that you will also have a conclusion - every speech needs to have a conclusion!  Set-up   * What is a technocracy? What is a representative democracy? How do we choose these technocrats, and what checks and balances exist? Give examples of the kind of people who become technocrats. You can use the very examples we discussed in class! * 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. * What do we mean by incentive of the motion? Do we mean burdens?   Argument 1   * Why would people make poor choices? * Why is evidence based decision making better? * 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. * Did we prove this happens? Or just that the possibility of this exists?   Argument 2   * Why do elected officials 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? * 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.  02:53 - we need to be able to speak up to 3-4 minutes next time! Especially when we have nearly 20 minutes of preparation time. Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **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! Why is democracy the best way to run a government? I need your opening to be more specific.  Set-up   * Rather than a literal definition, point out what the characteristics of a representative democracy are that we want to preserve. * We should pinpoint what the purpose of government is! Is it to make the ‘best’ decisions - and what even are these? Or is it representation and accountability? * We should try to co-opt their benefits of expertise. 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.   Rebuttal   * Good work asking questions about their model! Good attempt to incorporate humour into the rebuttal. We do spend too much time on this - we need to say this and move on from this! The upshot of this response needs to be clearer - that we have no idea who is making these decisions, and no reason to believe that this is good!   Argument 1   * In order for this argument to work, you need to first establish the nature of an elected official, then a technocrat, what the purpose of government is, and then the decisions that are made - and why they are better. * On knowledge - why is this exclusive to elected officials? Why and how does the process of an election give an elected official knowledge? Why can they automatically solve problems? We aren’t analysing the incentives of elected officials at all - and the checks they have; re-election incentive, the media reporting on them, approval ratings? * Our benefits are contingent on the right politician being chosen. We need to explain WHY people choose elected officials well; or where they don’t - why this is still okay! Can we prove that elected officials will always be better at the job?   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.  05:03  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jasper She |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening. The upshot of this example needs to be clear; elections do not reward merit or competence. All the benefits on Opp are reliant on good people being elected. This doesn’t happen. The example doesn’t just speak for itself!  Rebuttal   * Good work identifying you need to cover the gaps in set-up from earlier. However, this is not done as clearly; we say there will be panels, but then move onto the rebuttal. The point we need to make is why there are checks and balances. 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. Fill the gap, then respond. * Good on voters being incompetent - but we need to be more holistic.   + 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.   + Voters could be misinformed, prioritise short term gains, choose candidates on the basis of party affiliation, be misled etc.   Argument 1 - interesting claim, I hope you are able to prove the argument.   * We need to first establish why polarisation exists in the first place, and characterise this problem. * Good on the incentives of politicians to prioritise party affiliation, over outcomes based governance. Excellent example of the California fires. * We could be more comprehensive in our analysis. We need to explain why elected officials are also structurally incentivised to make popular decisions, rather than the ones which lead to change. Covid-19 is a good example of this. 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! * Good work comparing technocrats and elected officials in the KIND of policies they would make. * Clear impacting.   I think our tone does sound more intentional today, but we could still make more eye contact, and speak with more fluidity.  05:05  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  We don’t sound particularly confident at the start of our speech. We bend down and look at our paper, as opposed to making eye contact. Our opening needs to be more specific and clear! We just make a general observation.  Rebuttal   * Good on the ability to win elections; explain why people make good decisions. Jasper points out that most voters are high school drop-outs that don't make good decisions. You need to call him out for this and ask if this is a fair characterisation. * This is the **only** rebuttal we make. Are we fulfilling our speaker position responsibility here? * We need to engage with their new content on set-up and modelling - we had no response. * We need to engage with their claim on polarisation and partisanship - we had no response.   Argument 1   * In order for this argument to work, you need to break down the social contract - and the point of a government. You have access to all this analysis by virtue of the month we’ve spent on politics and governance - but this is missing from your speech. * We needed to analyse the purpose of the 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. * The space oil example doesn’t prove your argument? Do people perceive politicians in this way? If they do - you need to explain why this is true. * Is it good that people don’t challenge technocrats?   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.  04:10 - you have to speak to time. You had 20 minutes to prepare - this is unacceptable!  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Good opening. Is it that meritocracy is dying, or that it is already dead. The upshot of this example needs to be clear; elections do not reward merit or competence. All the benefits on Opp are reliant on good people being elected. This doesn’t happen - explain that this means that none of their benefits can materialise.  In signposting, all I want are the names of your two clashes. Don’t spend time on extraneous rebuttals, do not have just one clash. We have to follow the rules. The name of a clash also cannot be so long - it has to be short!  Rebuttal   * Technocrats - bring back the set-up and content from 2nd, and explain why it is true that we choose the most competent people. Trump went to university…   + Is it fair to say that they will be bad - the point should be that they can be super competent, but that doesn’t win you an election.   + 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.   + Voters could be misinformed, prioritise short term gains, choose candidates on the basis of party affiliation, be misled etc. * Trust - explain why or how people have lost faith in electoral politics. Or that what people care about is results. We’re just asserting what the people care about.   Rebuttal   * Good work identifying you need to cover the gaps in set-up from earlier. However, this is not done as clearly; we say there will be panels, but then move onto the rebuttal. The point we need to make is why there are checks and balances. 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. Fill the gap, then respond. * We are describing both in throwaway lines, rather than spending time establishing comprehensively the nature of these actors.   Clash 1   * What is an efficient system? You have to explain what this ideal system looks like first! * Why are they likely to have a plan? Why do their qualifications function as the tipping point? We need to analyse the problems of governance to be able to explain this. Otherwise, this is very vague!. We need to explain why elected officials are also structurally incentivised to make popular decisions, rather than the ones which lead to change. * How does this manipulation happen? Why does it happen?   05:19 - We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |