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

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:** [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  Is “equaler” a word?!   * Good hook about the imbalance of power between the prosecutors and the accused, link it back to plea bargaining to begin with. It isn’t immediately clear what plea bargaining even is at this point.   On the set-up:   * Try not to concede that “justice is slow,” when the reality is you’re proving that their version of justice is actually skewed. Exclude very explicitly that the real comparison is accurate justice vs injustice. * Excellent model on mitigating Opp’s problems on funding the court system.   + We also need to explain why your fiat involves mass amounts of money to begin with.   + We need something to deal with the lack of information on your side. How will you incentivise information from criminals?   In response to the POI, I appreciate the reinforcement that funding is actually the real solution.   * But why can’t the Opp also co-opt the public funding you proposed?   On the first argument:   * Why are the police allowed to threaten the accused in the process of plea bargaining?   + Explain that this is something that cannot be regulated effectively on Opp because the police need wide powers to conduct interrogations. * We need to explain the psyche of the accused and why they are likely to be fooled into this terrible deal.   + Explain the concept of wealth privilege and discrimination and why they feel like they cannot “afford” justice anyways, and will be falsely accused on both sides.   + Point out that checks and balances by the court is inadequate because it’s technically not coercion when the accused is incredibly willing, and will verify the same in court. * The impact of innocent convictions is not expanded! Explain the culpability of the state in oppressing disenfranchised minorities.   On the second argument:   * Very good claim on justice! Can we expand the premise to explain why justice must always be proportional in order to protect the rights of the victims? * We decided to focus on deterrence instead, but these people are not always let off scot-free! Most still end up in jail, and their deals are at the behest of prosecutors. So it’s not a guarantee that they will be let off. * We are missing the analysis as to why justice must be oriented towards victims! What exactly is the comparative?   + The Opp is also making a victim-oriented principle because they are saving time for future victims to have their cases heard. So we need to be more nuanced.   7.01 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:** [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  You’re claiming that OG is not responding to ‘justice delayed is justice denied,’ but in reality, Shi Qi never expanded on any of these things and I’m only hearing it here for the first time.   * We are under-executing, spend far more time on each mechanistic analysis such as the tampering of witnesses and contamination of evidence. * The impact of traumatising victims needs to be mechanised, why is waiting makes it worse for them mentally?   The angle of our rebuttal is to prove that organised crime is significant enough to justify plea bargaining, but Annabel’s challenge is actually that the information is minimal and unreliable!   * So explain that the police will investigate the veracity of these claims before offering a proper plea deal. We won’t be letting them go or we can punish them more if they are being obstacles to justice.   We should actively challenge Prop’s setup:   * Point out that Prop had ZERO mechanism to compensate for the lack of information they will suffer from. * We should also co-opt all of Prop’s funding to fix the flaws of the justice system! * Actively challenge whether Prop has all this fiat for significant funding anyways. They solve nothing. * Point out also that your counter set-up has REMOVED Prop’s criticisms on the active abuse of plea bargaining! Otherwise, we are not engaging with all of their harms of innocent convictions.   + Interesting pushback that innocent convictions will still happen. In this case, neither side is fixing such a structural problem, but you would also no longer be able to avail of your own checks and balances.   On the argument:   * It isn’t entirely clear how this material is entirely distinct from your first speaker. * We should expand the nature of crimes in syndicates and terrorist organisations where information is deeply insular and well-guarded.   + So the only way to bring it down from the inside is from this valuable information. Give me grounding for this. How can this information lead to the downfall of huge syndicates and lead to more utilitarian benefits?   We need to engage with the idea of proportionality!   * Explain proper that you are actually team justice because you safeguard future victims in more complex cases.   + Point out that it’s NORMAL to make these compromises, such as with parole because we solve things like prison overcrowding that leads to even more injustices.   5.44 - We are deeply under-timed. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:** [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  Excellent hook that plea bargaining comes at the expense of justice, and leads to outcomes of innocent convictions.   * But we need to be more engaging with LO stating that innocent convictions would still happen if prosecutors and courts are deeply prejudiced as you characterised.   After proving that justice is actually skewed on Opp’s side, exclude very explicitly that the real comparison is accurate justice vs injustice.   * Can we spend some time mitigating Opp’s problems on the inefficiencies and explain why it does solve all of their problems?   + Also, why can’t the Opp also co-opt the public funding you proposed?   Well done on tearing down why the quality of the information is quite poor, and doesn’t lead to the outcomes they desire on bringing down syndicates.   * But all this does is only washing out the benefit. * We still need something to deal with the lack of information on your side. How will you incentivise information from criminals?   Where we are not engaging is the fact you are not the team that protects everybody, Opp has argued that the cases of other victims are adversely impacted by the backlog of cases.   * The Opp is also making a victim-oriented principle because they are saving time for future victims to have their cases heard. So we need to be more nuanced and deal with the fact that a trade-off needs to happen, and no team has a win-win case here.   Speak a lot slower, Annabel! Many things fall through the cracks when you’re speaking at this speed.  On the argument:   * Before the loss of trust claim, you need to engage with Opp’s claim that injustices are symmetrical if the police are racist and corrupt.   + Otherwise, this is a harm that happens on both sides.   + Also, Opp gave a couple of set-ups to actively fix the problem such as regulating the police, so we need to spend time explaining why this won’t even work.     - Explain that this is something that cannot be regulated effectively on Opp because the police need wide powers to conduct interrogations. * The impact of loss of trust is not expanded!   + How does it actively hurt the entirety of the criminal justice system and strengthen criminal culture without collaboration?   6.49 - We are under-timed, wait for the second bell! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:** [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  Good, clear hook on where the Opp enters the debate! Consider a high-impact hook, rather than just a summative one.  On the counter set-up:   * An interesting new model on limiting the ability of prosecutors to lie. Bear in mind you will have to defend a significantly lower rate of effectiveness during the investigation process.   + A better set-up would be utilising the role of the judges to verify the plea deal. * Good job highlighting the unique roles of plea bargaining when it comes to inciting valuable information against groups like criminal syndicates.   + Point out that Prop had ZERO mechanism to compensate for the lack of information they will suffer from.   We should also co-opt all of Prop’s funding to fix the flaws of the justice system!   * Actively challenge whether Prop has all this fiat for significant funding anyways. They solve nothing.   Interesting pushback that the poor would still be punished by the courts, but this means that the courts are critically flawed and that it will still lead to false convictions.   * In this case, neither side is fixing such a structural problem, but you would also no longer be able to avail of your own checks and balances.   On the first argument:   * We have a tendency to move too fast to the next analytical layer, spend more time on each section. * We should expand the nature of crimes in syndicates and terrorist organisations where information is deeply insular and well-guarded.   + So the only way to bring it down from the inside is from this valuable information. Give me grounding for this. How can this information lead to the downfall of huge syndicates and lead to more utilitarian benefits.   Don’t combine the first argument with pragmatic justice, it’s an entirely different claim!   * Where else has this been done in the justice system? Why do we prioritise practicality over justices?   + Explain proper that you are actually team justice because you safeguard future victims in more complex cases.   + Point out that it’s NORMAL to make these compromises, such as with parole because we solve things like prison overcrowding that leads to even more injustices.   We need to engage with the idea of proportionality!   * Justice is not rigid, we mitigate sentences all the time for factors completely unrelated to the commission of the crime, e.g. the criminal has to provide for their children, the criminal gives back to society. This isn’t any different because saving the time and resources of the state is helping other victims. 6.59 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  There is always TIME for a hook, be disciplined please!  On the set-up:   * As the closing, don’t suggest that your model ought to REPLACE your opening. Just say that you are mechanising what their set-up lacks. * Many of these things are not actually set-up, and just rebuttal/framing.   + On combing through every single evidence, this would worsen the problem statement on Opp on the massive bureaucratic costs of justice.   + After stating that buy-in is CG’s winning framing, actually tell me why this is the case!   Your rebuttal on the pawns having questionable information has been argued by Annabel.   * All this does is only wash out the benefit on Prop. To win the clash, we still need something to deal with the lack of information on your side. How will you incentivise information from criminals?   After proving that justice is actually skewed on Opp’s side, exclude very explicitly that the real comparison is accurate justice vs injustice.  On the extension:   * Very good analysis on the perverse incentives of prosecutors to abuse plea bargaining.   + Frame this properly to explain that this information means that plea bargaining can never be effectively regulated by the Opp, and this information means CG ranks above OG on the propensity of abuse. * A lot of the analysis is overlapping with both your rebuttal and Annabel’s speech! * On the lack of buy-in, before proving this claim, you need to engage with Opp’s claim that injustices are symmetrical if the police are racist and corrupt.   + Otherwise, this is a harm that happens on both sides.   + Also, Opp gave a couple of set-ups to actively fix the problem such as regulating the police, so we need to spend time explaining why this won’t even work.     - Explain that this is something that cannot be regulated effectively on Opp because the police need wide powers to conduct interrogations. * The impact of loss of trust is not expanded!   + How does it actively hurt the entirety of the criminal justice system and strengthen criminal culture without collaboration?   Where we are not engaging is the fact that Opp has argued that the cases of other victims are adversely impacted by the backlog of cases. We are only focused on the organised syndicate portion.   * The Opp is also making a victim-oriented principle because they are saving time for future victims to have their cases heard.   7.11 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:** [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  Good hook on Prop punishing the wrong people, but link it back to the motion clearly. This is Gov’s claim, not Opp’s, so it’s not clear how this is exclusive to your side.  Don’t end too early by just naming your extension, as closing, you have to do both the tasks of differentiating your extension from Opening AND telling me why it’s MORE important than opening.  Excellent challenge on Prop not having fiat for all of this funding, and it can be easily co-opted by Opp!   * Please spend time on reinforcing Opp’s counter mechs as well to deal with all of the abuses done by prosecutors!   There is zero need to take 3 POIs, 2 should be maximum!   * There is also a tendency to SPEED through each rebuttal without realising that rebuttals have the same kind of analytical burden as arguments. We are just asserting claims and moving on without proving them.   On the extension:   * On the difficulty of reintegrating criminals into society, it just sounds like you oppose long sentences per se! This isn’t something you structurally remove, long sentences still exist on your side!   + You are also trading off accurate and proportional justice here if you just hate long sentences, when the criminals actively deserve it.     - Explain proper that you are actually team justice because you safeguard future victims in more complex cases.     - Point out that it’s NORMAL to make these compromises, such as with parole because we solve things like prison overcrowding that leads to even more injustices. * On utilising far more time, can we spend time proving first the true cost for even a single additional trial to be held? Explain the bureaucratic costs of how long it takes, how much personnel, and how much money is involved. * This can easily be flipped against you! Because members of society can also deem your punishment to be unjust, impose prejudice against the criminals and refuse to reintegrate them.   + How am I supposed to weigh which version is worse for integration, when both sides claim a perception of injustice? * The confusion on whether or not you are innocent is probably far worse in a world where the criminal receives a plea deal! People may believe that the deal is what obscures the justice provided by trials.   The entire extension sounds like you hate fundamental facets of the justice system, such as long sentences and extended trials. All of these things exist regardless.  7.13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will abolish plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speech is 7 minutes’ long.]  Aside from reinforcing Gov’s case is general, have a view of the actual CG cases so that you will be weighed over OG.   * On reinforcing the perverse incentives of prosecutors to abuse plea bargaining:   + Frame this properly to explain that this information means that plea bargaining can never be effectively regulated by the Opp. OG did not engage with OO’s counter mechanisms, so this information means CG ranks above OG on the propensity of abuse.   Good reinforcement of the defense mechanism on why the information utilised will have very little value, but this is an argument already made by Annabel.   * All this does is only wash out the benefit on Prop. To win the clash, we still need something to deal with the lack of information on your side. How will you incentivise information from criminals? * To prove that something is unique, you can’t just assert that it is unique! The point has already been mentioned at this point. * The analytical gap in Jodie’s extension at this point is about the lack of public buy-in. Before proving this claim, you need to engage with Opp’s claim that injustices are symmetrical if the police are racist and corrupt. Otherwise, this is a harm that happens on both sides.   + Also, Opp gave a couple of set-ups to actively fix the problem such as regulating the police, so we need to spend time explaining why this won’t even work.     - Explain that this is something that cannot be regulated effectively on Opp because the police need wide powers to conduct interrogations.   Good job engaging on the point of inefficiency.   * Well done on victims may even have more trust because the courts are spending time investigating it, as well as them being happy on the victims * Why do we say we’re happy to trade off justice? Your actual framing is your version of justice is more accurate than Opp’s justice!   + After proving that justice is actually skewed on Opp’s side, exclude very explicitly that the real comparison is accurate justice vs injustice.   We should be engaging with CO in a very explicit way.   * Well done on flipping the claim, but spend more time on the comparative on why there’s even MORE stigma via a plea deal as opposed to a court process.   + Spend time explaining that CO is simply opposing fundamental facets of the justice system that will exist on either side.   Where we are not engaging is the fact that Opp has argued that the cases of other victims are adversely impacted by the backlog of cases. We are only focused on the organised syndicate portion.   * The Opp is also making a victim-oriented principle because they are saving time for future victims to have their cases heard.   7.10 | | | | | | |