| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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! Don’t say it’s about personal opinions, but about emotional and passionate responses.  Set-up   * Excellent explanation of what a politician is, and what the distinction between a technocrat and a politician is. Good on qualifications. * Why is CJS policy a field that has a clear cut distinction of what works and doesn’t work? Explain why it isn’t one where you are making subjective moral decisions. * Good on having a panel, you don’t have to specify a specific number. What checks or balances exist against them? What happens if they mess up? How do we get rid of them? Who appoints them? * Is help so blanket? Is approval so blanket?   POI: Don’t say yap - explain that the nature of electoral politics is such that it creates time limits, term limits, incentives to always change the policy of your predecessor.  Argument 1   * You need to establish what the nature of electoral politics is; assume that ideological biases and polarisation don’t exist and make this argument on the strongest possible grounds. Then introduce the realities of politics. * What kinds of policies get passed in OO’s world that do not in yours? * We need to establish what the distinction between incentives is more systematically. Discuss the incentives of each group and how this impacts their decision-making. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. * Is time the only concern? * Why are we assuming they will be corrupt? Is corruption the biggest problem in the CJS? You have to characterise what kinds of policies due to the ideological flip flopping exist; what mess do they create? * Rather than state that politicians are just not experts, explain the precise perverse incentive that tough on crime laws are populist and lead to easy votes.   Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice. E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanise criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity.  We have to explain that there are certain policies which are good, but politicians will never implement because of how resource intensive they are - this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.  04:47  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  You have to start by establishing what the biggest distinction between these two actors is; and what the nature of CJS policy is - that this isn’t like health policy, where there is a clear sense of what is right and what is not.  These are subjective, moral choices and only people we give power to should have the power to make these choices in the first place.  Good on potential checks and balances - explain what is sufficient or good about this, in comparison to a complete outsourcing.  What is the structure of this speech?  Good observation that technocrats also have pre-existing incentives; what kind of sponsors do they have, and why are these incentives not present in the comparative? Why are technocrats worse compared to elected politicians? Don’t say you’ll explain it later, explain it now!  Why are the public’s choices and approval so needed? You need to explain why their opinions are correct, or just or valuable! For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking amongst technocrats.  Democratic representation should have been the essence of your case!   * Why public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies, * Why criminal justice can only work when it reflects public sentiments, * The harms of criminal justice policies that are undemocratic.   We assert that politicians make good decisions, and help the vulnerable but to the extent this is a voting minority, why is this true?  05:10  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  Don’t just ask this question of what is the distinction, because the distinction is intuitive - the party with the final decision making power was elected. You need to explain why quality of decision matters more than process. Why is CJS policy a field that has a clear cut distinction of what works and doesn’t work? Explain why it isn’t one where you are making subjective moral decisions.  Don’t make it about expertise - assume these politicians are very well informed. Rather than state that politicians are just not experts, explain the precise perverse incentive that tough on crime laws are populist and lead to easy votes.  Explain why they don’t have the **incentives** to behave in ‘good’ ways. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice. E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanises criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity.  We have to explain that there are certain policies which are good, but politicians will never implement because of how resource intensive they are - this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.  You can also explain that the nature of electoral politics is such that it creates time limits, term limits, incentives to always change the policy of your predecessor.  POI: Focus on the standardised guideline - why would it not be standardised under elected representatives?  Clash   * You need to establish what the nature of electoral politics is; assume that ideological biases and polarisation don’t exist and make this argument on the strongest possible grounds. Then introduce the realities of politics.   Explain why the citizens are incorrect or misinformed; it is stronger to argue that it isn’t even about the citizens, it is about special interests and lobbyists - this is the influence we seek to remove from politics.  We need to clean structure up a little bit more - try and identify 2-3 key issues, respond in that way rather than having a clash at 4.  05:08 - We have to ask POIs!  **We aren’t engaging with any of the claims on people knowing better and making good decisions when voting. Why? These are such easy responses to make!** | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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:  The opening is too long without a clear explanation of what the winning/losing issue in the round is.  You have to start by establishing what the biggest distinction between these two actors is; and what the nature of CJS policy is - that this isn’t like health policy, where there is a clear sense of what is right and what is not.   * These are subjective, moral choices and only people we give power to should have the power to make these choices in the first place.   Good push on how they probably need to defend having this across fields.  The logistical constraints of technocrats are very easy to flip - we can pay them well, we can ensure they have time; focus on their nature, rather than availability! Why is our focus so heavily on their model and operationality?  Explain why the policies that are being voted on and approved by the public are the good policies to begin with! Why are the public’s choices and approval so needed? You need to explain why their opinions are correct, or just or valuable!   * For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking amongst technocrats.   Democratic representation should have been the essence of your case!   * Why public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies, * Why criminal justice can only work when it reflects public sentiments, * The harms of criminal justice policies that are undemocratic.   We assert that politicians make good decisions, and help the vulnerable but to the extent this is a voting minority, why is this true?  05:18 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  You can wash out corruption and efficiency; there are incentives on both sides to take speedy action; take OO out of the debate by talking about how they assume that voters are informed, make good decisions, and hence so do politicians. This is incorrect. Once you do this, move onto dealing with OG - there is lots to extend on! You can make the model fixes that take care of all the pushes from OO.  Excellent on appealing to the poor and vulnerable. Good identification! Explain then the kind of CJS policies being pushed - such as tough on crime policies which punish the poor. We have to explain that there are certain policies which are good, but politicians will never implement because of how resource intensive they are - this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.  Talk about special interests and lobbying! Explain why the citizens are incorrect or misinformed; it is stronger to argue that it isn’t even about the citizens, it is about special interests and lobbyists - this is the influence we seek to remove from politics.  POI - we can just say we’ll bar them from receiving shady funding etc. Clear analysis on incentives. Good!  Good on how embedded technocracy can work - but this really undermines the commitment to quality and objective decision-making on your side.  Extensions (?) at 3:44? What was the above? Let’s watch a few Member speeches to get a better sense of how to structure this out.  You need to explain why quality of decision matters more than process. Why is CJS policy a field that has a clear cut distinction of what works and doesn’t work? Explain why it isn’t one where you are making subjective moral decisions.  Explain why they don’t have the **incentives** to behave in ‘good’ ways. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice. E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanises criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity.  Shoot themselves in the shoe? Or the foot?  The structure is messy, but great analysis and coverage.  05:04 | | | | | | |