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

| **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:  Good opening; we need to characterise more stringently how a miscarriage of justice is taking place - that the poor are being disproportionately incarcerated. Let’s try to curate our problem with more attention to phrasing.  Set-up   * Why will more of the budget be allocated here? Explain why political capital and will did not exist prior, but does now. You can’t just rely on fiat to do this. * We should distinguish between private and public defenders; we should definitely explain why this difference exists - is it because of funding, is it because of training, what is the reason? We need to understand WHY they are worse to make sure we solve the problem in full!   Argument 1   * What is the central claim or thesis for this argument? * Good work starting by setting up the problem; explain how this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - and the kind of practices they employ as a consequence; we should talk about plea bargaining, about out of court settlements and so forth. We eventually do this, but should really iron out the structure of the argument to clearly build up to a specific outcome + impact; for instance - the first thing I’m going to establish is how the systematic overworking of public defenders means they lose more cases… * We should then contrast this by characterising private lawyers:   + They have smaller caseloads, more time - which all leads to a more thorough investigation, more extensive legal research, and more time to prepare for trial.   + They can also be more aggressive - they could file motions to suppress evidence, challenging the prosecution's case more vigorously, and take cases to trial more often. * Well, more public defenders are being hired, but isn’t the workload anyways? Don’t shadow-box what the other side might say; but the point should be that voters don’t care because most of them don’t commit crime/lots can afford it - this is the average voter, not the average person to be clear. We need to incentivise these people to care about the system - and the way to do it is by increasing their personal stake in the situation. * You need to explain how this distinction and advantage goes away to create a better and fairer system. * On the same lawyer to all - explain why this version of justice is fair and legitimate. * What’s the harm here - if the system is broken! Explain who gets free and gets away, and what harms [to] the public this creates. Does it reduce trust in the system? Do they feel alienated and let down by the state? The impact of this argument isn’t being explained!   We can also run a principle on why it’s justified to limit people spending the money they worked hard to earn; why the system being fair matters more than the quality of the trial here. For instance, that we need to ensure a baseline level of competent representation for everyone; and that public trust in the judiciary matters more than the autonomy of people in this case.  05:10 - Let’s make sure to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **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:  Why is there no fairness? You can’t start with a grand line, and then have no follow-up at all! What is this achieving? We need to make sure our opening highlights the central issue - which is that the current system is too overloaded; highlight very clearly what your stance is here; which is that we need to uplift those who suffer, not drag everyone down together. The speed and immediacy of signposting showcases that you’re nervous + flustered - stay calm and demonstrate that you’re in control over what you are saying!  Set-up   * Fair on limits on settlements - but does this solve the key issue? * We needed to explain that we will let people use private defenders, but pump funding into public defense/make private lawyers more accessible to the poor; through subsidies, or even policies. Does our set-up engage with the harm accruing to the poor on Prop at all? * For instance, we could mandate lower caseload limits for public defenders, we could provide public defender offices with dedicated investigative resources, including investigators, forensic experts, and other specialists   Rebuttal   * Point that they don’t have the fiat to just increase funding for public defenders - they need to explain how this happens. * POI - fair response.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What outcome are we trying to prove? We needed to explain why it is the case that the poor don’t suffer on our side - creating a practical argument linked to the model on creating access. The point to make is that now everyone has a bad lawyer who is overworked and underfunded - things go worse for everyone! * Did you prove anything here? I need you to spend MORE TIME on your arguments, rather than rushing through!   Argument 2   * What is the thesis of this argument? What outcome are we trying to prove? I think you’re confusing criminal and civil cases here; this isn’t about the prosecution - just the defence!   We needed to explain why there is a moral right to spend money in the ways people want! The money individuals earn is the product of their labor and effort; this is the fruit of their labour - they have a fundamental moral right to control and dispose of their earnings as they see fit, including spending it on goods and services they deem essential, such as legal representation. Ask if this will ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; or will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?  05:00 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **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:  Do we have to repeat our speaker position? If we’re saying they’ve made a big mistake - you need to tell me what the mistake is, and why it matters. You can’t just say this and then move on!  Rebuttal   * Why would they do this? Why wouldn’t they pursue other areas of law - such as corporate law, or international rights etc. Saying ‘read the motion’ isn’t sufficient response. You need to explain how you create more public defenders, or reduce the load on them at present. The mechanism to correct the system + making it robust is missing.   + The point is that funding to these departments isn’t a voting issue because it doesn’t impact the average voter. They are ignored because the wealthy don’t use them! The poor aren’t a pertinent voting demographic, hence, politicians don’t pander to them. We lack the tax money to increase budgets, because this isn’t seen as an issue to the extent that the wealthy basically buy their way out - we invest them into the system when it suddenly hurts them. * On public safety - we need to explain this! What’s the harm here - if the system is broken! Explain who gets free and gets away, and what harms [to] the public this creates. Does it reduce trust in the system? Do they feel alienated and let down by the state? The impact isn’t being explained! * You didn’t at all call them out for not engaging on the poor, and how the poor get neglected on their side!   Argument 1   * The mechanism as to how this ‘equality’ is achieved isn’t there. You’re just comparing impacts. * Explain how this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - and the kind of practices they employ as a consequence; we should talk about plea bargaining, about out of court settlements and so forth. We should really iron out the structure of the argument to clearly build up to a specific outcome + impact; for instance - the first thing I’m going to establish is how the systematic overworking of public defenders means they lose more cases… * We should then contrast this by characterising private lawyers:   + They have smaller caseloads, more time - which all leads to a more thorough investigation, more extensive legal research, and more time to prepare for trial.   + They can also be more aggressive - they could file motions to suppress evidence, challenging the prosecution's case more vigorously, and take cases to trial more often. * On the same lawyer to all - explain why this version of justice is fair and legitimate.   We can also run a principle on why it’s justified to limit people spending the money they worked hard to earn; why the system being fair matters more than the quality of the trial here. For instance, that we need to ensure a baseline level of competent representation for everyone; and that public trust in the judiciary matters more than the autonomy of people in this case.  05:00 - we didn’t ask a single POI today! | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Bribes? No! That’s literally illegal. Settlements are a yes; I think the identification of how the wealthy abuse the system to the greatest extent possible to get away scot-free is good; but you need to explain how the solution isn’t to deprive the average person of a private lawyer; it’s to increase the quality of public defense, and make the existing system stronger against the wealthy.  We needed to explain that we will let people use private defenders, but pump funding into public defense/make private lawyers more accessible to the poor; through subsidies, or even policies. If First Opp doesn’t do this, you need to fill this gap - does our set-up engage with the harm accruing to the poor on Prop at all?   * For instance, we could mandate lower caseload limits for public defenders, we could provide public defender offices with dedicated investigative resources, including investigators, forensic experts, and other specialists   Rebuttal   * Good work pointing out that they don’t have the fiat to just increase funding for public defenders - they need to explain how this happens. * This cannot be the only response we have! We need to engage on their argument about how their policy is the only way to help the poor, on how they’re limiting people’s freedom to do with their money what they please, that there is no explanation as to how they get more public defenders on their side.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * You can’t take more than TWO POIs! This isn’t a back and forth with Chester. * What is the thesis of this argument? What outcome are we trying to prove? We needed to explain why it is the case that the poor don’t suffer on our side - creating a practical argument linked to the model on creating access. The point to make is that now everyone has a bad lawyer who is overworked and underfunded - things go worse for everyone!   We needed to explain why there is a moral right to spend money in the ways people want! The money individuals earn is the product of their labor and effort; this is the fruit of their labour - they have a fundamental moral right to control and dispose of their earnings as they see fit, including spending it on goods and services they deem essential, such as legal representation. Ask if this will ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; or will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?  04:19 - we didn’t ask a single POI today! | | | | | | |