| **Student Name:** Prop 1 |
| --- |

| **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:  Start   * Well formed sentences to start the speech with. Good signposting before illustrating your arguments. * You must specify that it is only for criminal cases. The fact that the term exists in the motion means there’s some relevance - what is it? Must be state.   Model   * “Same training, salary, training” - same with whom? Can’t be same with private lawyers, so I am assuming its same within public defenders. So there won’t be promotions? * The claim that there will be less corruption is linked with? Are you arguing that there is corruption currently in the system? If so, state it. * When you say both sides, you should be aware that the prosecution is always state represented. I’m not sure what both sides means here? * We’re talking about civil cases, so its not that there’s a Plaintiff that’s represented by public defender vs other side is also represented by public defenders.   Argument 1   * Resources: The idea that private lawyers have more resources so they can do more is a bad thing? Why is that the case? How does your side produce competent public defenders by simply moving private ones out? * Same amount of workload: i’m not sure what you mean by ‘same’. The comparison with whom here? * Corruption: the idea that private lawyers are corrupted isn’t explained well. Not sure how it links to your case well. * The point about there’s more transparency under your side is undercooked.   + Practically, how is transparency improved under your side?   + How do public defenders look like now and how does that change? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Opp 1 |
| --- |

| **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:  Opening   * Commanding start to the speech. * Good job establishing the context of public defenders as under-paid and overworked.   + Are there more points to show bad conditions? * Good job signposting. There’s some hint of confusion there, but can be fixed with better prep.   Substantive   * When you argue that they are underpaid and overworked - that is the same thing as the stance you built.   + Is there any extra layer of analysis here? * The point about how prop disadvantages people further, that’s a reasonable point. But it lacks analysis.   + Can we argue that the prop doesn’t make it better for public defenders, but rather make it worse - which brings worse outcome.   + Can we argue that it compromises the ability to have good investigations?   + Is there a possibility of several bad cases and delays? * Good point about public defenders not well trained.   + However, these are things that don’t require a separate substantive. There could be an easy list of things that shows the problems with public defenders. Then you can easily move to the outcomes and stress on other important things in the argument.   + The unfairness to the defendants is a repeated point. * When you move to another argument about underfunded lawyers and lack of incentives, this is again the same repetition thats pointed out above. * Is there a unique impact here? * Can it be argued that for specific cases, like murder cases that require good amount of understanding of the defendant, public defenders are incompetent. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Prop 2 |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Opening   * Try speaking with better fluency while producing your hook. * Try looking above your notes while talking to the audience. * Good signposting before running to your rebuttals and arguments   Rebuttals & Substantive   * Point about when everyone is a public defender, there will be standardised training   + What does this training look like?   + Is there hierarchy? Like someones better than the other?   + When you say they will be paid for how much they work, what does that mean mechanistically? * The point that there will be more public defender on prop lacks basis.   + Is it because private lawyers will switch to public defenders?   + Is it that government will provide more incentive? * Misjudgment against innocent people   + When you argue that the wealthy can get away with crimes, is it the case that our legal system is broken?   + Or are there legal ways in which private defenders are able to advocate for reduced sentence? * When these changes are being made, how do you ensure efficiency of public defenders beyond the claim that there will be more of them. * Costs/Prices: The point about it taking away misconception must be backed with how you get better results under your side in the first place. This link is missing throughout. * The point about how public defenders can help people must have a link with technical reasons as to why they will have that incentive. It isn’t clear how they will have a work-life balance now. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Opp 2 |
| --- |

| **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:  Opening   * There’s a hint of confusion as you move from one sentence to the other. Can be fixed with better prep and confidence. * Good job signposting.   Rebuttals   * Workload: This idea is sensible, however, its the same as produced before.   + Is there a new layer of analysis? * Standardised salary: Fair point about how there won’t be added incentive when the salary is fixed.   + Here, can you reinforce the link with private defenders? * Reestablishment/Clarification/Interpretation/Stating of your stance hasn’t happened yet, and it is already past 2:30 minutes in your speech.   Substantive   * “People will go to corporate law and other fields due to low motivation”   + Good point. Can you mention mechanistically/technically why they won’t go to become public defenders? * The idea about losing motivation is once again heavily repeated without new interpretation. * Can you talk about how effectiveness of justice system is higher on your side?   + can you reinforce the benefits of hiring a private lawyer?   + Or at least the ability to have that as a choice? * The point about lack of training once again is repeated without new interpretation. * Instead of weighing the case of both side separately when you have 40 seconds left, it is better to either do it when you have more time, or incorporate it within arguments. | | | | | | |