| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  Why is it so much worse? Spotlight ONE big issue rather than giving me a whole host of reasons. We want to illustrate how long it takes, and the harm this creates. For instance, on COVID-19, or during a natural disaster.  Set-up   * Remember - we don’t define literally, we define in context! We need to establish what the characteristics of centralisation are! For instance, that there is speed and efficiency in decision-making, a clear chain of command, coordinated responses to crises.   + Good use of examples here on what they are able to do. What are they not able to do? * We need to explain why there are natural incentives for some elements of accountability to exist. For instance, consulting experts on economic issues, or deciding on bills elected representatives have presented and worked on in the first place.   Argument 1   * On efficiency - is this argument existing in all contexts, or a specific context? For instance, in an emergency or crisis? Why is efficiency consistently the most important factor in what decisions the state should take. * What is the cost of not having efficiency? We need to explain why this would not exist in the counterfactual, so explaining incentives to disagree and hold up decisions, diversity in views, polarisation and tribalism as we talked about in class! * What do we mean by different branches - why would they block each other, under conditions of both good will and malintent - for instant, genuine disagreements on socio-economic status, or political tribalism. * What is the outcome and impact of this argument? What is the value of efficiency? * POI - it is that these are elected individuals at the end of the day, who do not want protests or push back from people. There are some boundaries and parameters that exist.   We need to mitigate against the obvious Opp push that this can lead to a concentration of power, with limited checks and balances; that this is the state overstepping in decision-making because it is not consulting elected representatives in the way that it should.   * + Why are these the incentives of heads of state? Why are they concerned for instance, by re-election incentive, such that they will not abuse their power?   Your conclusion should not be you repeating the motion! Give me a punchy outro!  We have to speak louder, with more variation in tone, pace and emphasis!  05:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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:  What are these ‘wrong things’ - why are these elected heads of state bad actors? You’re focusing on the right call out, but you need to establish why what you claim here is likely, and how it manifests!  Signposting? What is the structure of this speech?  Set-up   * Distribution of power and representation - good. * Clear illustration of what exactly the system of government looks like in your world. * Give me examples of these checks and balances!   Rebuttal   * On efficiency - don’t repeat the response from earlier, without elaborating or adding analysis. I think you need to establish why this debate isn’t happening within the context of an emergency or crisis. * We need to explain why a slower process, and the disagreement Ellie references, doesn’t harm, but rather checks against more extreme heads of state like Trump. The point is - their benefit is contingent on the President or head of state being reasonable.   Argument 1   * Good work establishing the type of representation that you support; don’t just assert the social contract! Instead, explain the conditions under which we give up our rights and freedoms, and why this does not fall into those. * We needed to argue the state power principle - and how centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.   Argument 2   * Do not make Trump a substitute for analysis! Explain how, beyond Trump, structurally, abuses occur. * Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so high; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. * Point out how your side SOLVES this problem - for instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world?   I would strongly recommend that you increase the frequency of your speech practice, whether that be at school, at home, or with Capstone in spars! This will help us improve faster.  05:01 - take a POI! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  Good identification! Give me an example, or illustrate this polarisation or tribalism. Explain how this occurs in a really malicious way that actually hurts people and undermines the very democratic process that Opp supports.  Good work signposting! Is the metric for victory which side is more democratic, or which sides benefits people more?  Rebuttal   * Why does it matter? In what situations or conditions does it matter? You need to impact which government functions get held up, and why they are so valuable. The singular example I have is on welfare payments from your side. This is one example, as opposed to being established as a general claim in the round. * On democracy - we need to explain why centralisation doesn’t mean checks and balances go away. Elections still exist, the free media still exists, there are natural incentives for some elements of accountability to exist. For instance, consulting experts on economic issues, or deciding on bills elected representatives have presented and worked on in the first place. * POI - respond quickly and clearly! The response is as above.   Why we win? Since when is this a segment of your speech? Where is your second speaker argument?  We need to establish the comparative - which is that there would be bureaucratic delays or disagreements. We need to explain why this would not exist in the counterfactual, so explaining incentives to disagree and hold up decisions, diversity in views, polarisation and tribalism as we talked about in class!  We need to mitigate against the obvious Opp push that this can lead to a concentration of power, with limited checks and balances; that this is the state overstepping in decision-making because it is not consulting elected representatives in the way that it should.   * Why are these the incentives of heads of state? Why are they concerned for instance, by re-election incentive, such that they will not abuse their power?   05:09 - let’s have a punchier conclusion! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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. Good use of the discussion we had earlier! You need to engage with the lack of sufficient response from 2P on checks and balances, or rather the lack thereof.  We have TWO arguments as second?  Rebuttal   * Inefficiency - too much authority to singular authorities. Fair, but does this challenge speed? You are questioning the value of efficiency, rather than whether or not it happens or not. You need to explain how in emergency situations, your side has tools to use; that we declare emergency states and expedite decision-making; but this should not be the default manner or method of governance! * Good on how this occurs when there is disagreement - when would that be? You need to analyse where branches would stop each other in good faith - and why the concerns raised might be incredibly important. You’re not exploring this at all! You also need to engage with the context of tribalism and polarisation that Ethan talks about!   Argument 1   * What are these opinions, why are they valuable, and why do they get ignored in Prop’s world? * How does your side get these laws passed, as opposed to them getting stuck in the legislative under endless debate!   Argument 2   * Is this new or distinct? * We needed to bring back the state power principle - and how centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.   Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so high; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. Point out how your side SOLVES this problem - for instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world?  Don’t run two arguments, focus on one good one instead!  05:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Theo Lee |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  What is this opening achieving? It’s just a summary of what they support - I know you’re here to tell me that they are wrong…  Rebuttals - try to minimise rebuttals outside of clashes as far as possible. Save it for clarifications or strategic observations instead.   * Good on how they are elected. Point out how there are actual checks and balances for the head of state. Elections still exist, the free media still exists, there are natural incentives for some elements of accountability to exist. For instance, consulting experts on economic issues, or deciding on bills elected representatives have presented and worked on in the first place. * Why are we dealing with efficiency here, when there is a full clash dedicated to it below? Don’t use an example to respond - if they flip the example, this point is done. * You talk about authoritarianism next - but you dealt with this earlier, you’re getting into repetition territory here. Good response to the POI - be more structural and poised in the answer. * On the third term thing - this is untrue, Republicans are trying to reintroduce this presently.   Clash 1 - Efficiency v C/B (at 3:26)   * Why do you uphold the general will better? We need to establish the comparative beyond the Obama example - which is that there would be bureaucratic delays or disagreements. We need to explain why this would not exist in the counterfactual, so explaining incentives to disagree and hold up decisions, diversity in views, polarisation and tribalism as we talked about in class!   Clash 2 - Polarisation   * We have to make the value of efficiency abundantly clear. Why is efficiency the most important measure for what is a good law, or a good government? Explain how modern threats require rapid responses, that limited government resources demand optimal use, and that visible results maintain public support. * Explain why polarisation means no policies get passed, and the government is in constant gridlock - explain how politicians have malicious incentives and hold up the law making process.   We need to mitigate against the obvious Opp push that this can lead to a concentration of power, with limited checks and balances; that this is the state overstepping in decision-making because it is not consulting elected representatives in the way that it should.   * Why are these the incentives of heads of state? Why are they concerned for instance, by re-election incentive, such that they will not abuse their power?   05:11 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  Why would power be abused, and why would fair representation not exist? How have they failed?  Rebuttals - try to minimise rebuttals outside of clashes as far as possible. Save it for clarifications or strategic observations instead.   * Inefficiency - don’t spend as much time summarising the claim they make. On the faster process, explain what this comes at the cost of! What is the value of different opinions? We say this in an abstract fashion without grounding what this looks like practically! Give me an illustration of how this harm occurs!   + You need to explain how in emergency situations, your side has tools to use; that we declare emergency states and expedite decision-making; but this should not be the default manner or method of governance! * POI - You need to analyse where branches would stop each other in good faith - and why the concerns raised might be incredibly important. * Polarisation - I’m not sure I understand the response here. Polarisation is when people believe in extreme versions of ideas, and refuse to compromise or consider the middle ground. You need to engage with the bad faith stopping per the polarisation Ethan and Theo talk about; i.e. polarisation drives politicians to object to legislation because of polarisation.   Clash 1   * We can’t say we won the clash 5 seconds into it. You need to engage in thorough rebuttal on this issue properly! * We needed to bring back the state power principle - and how centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.   Clash 2   * The same applies here. You aren’t responding thoroughly enough but claiming you win on this issue. * Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so high; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. Point out how your side SOLVES this problem - for instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world?   How many POIs did we ask today?  05:02 | | | | | | |