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

| **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! Clear tone, clear harm being established. The training is the same, the pay + hours + workload are different.  Set-up   * Clear stance! * On this, you need to explain why private defense attorneys choose to go into public defense, rather than corporate law or some other area of law? * You should explain how you increase the budget allocated to public defenders - explain why political capital and will did not exist prior, but does now. * The random list of benefits at the end isn’t necessarily achieving anything! * We should also 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 thesis or central claim of this argument? Give me a roadmap! * Go beyond ‘they are good with words’ please. 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 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. * What do we mean they care about money? Will they take bribes? That’s illegal! * 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. 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.  05:09 - let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 could phrase this with more clarity + slow down when delivering it. 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.  Set-up must come first!  Rebuttal   * We need to explain HOW we sort this out! The set-up is only coming out in response to the POI that Emilia asks!   + 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 * We need to engage with their model - that these private defense attorneys will choose to go into public defense when given this choice; why is this true?   + They could choose a whole host of other things!   Argument 1   * Is training the difference? Or is it capacity? * 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! * The analysis as to why people can access private lawyers is missing. 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? * Excellent reference to double jeopardy!   06:04 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **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 explain why public defenders aren’t overburdened and overextended on our side of the world; so resolving the model questions from 1st Prop; we need to go beyond saying more public defenders will exist because private defense attorneys are given an ultimatum to join or leave. Why wouldn’t they pursue other areas of law - such as corporate law, or international rights etc.  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. This is the POI Davian asks as well!  Is this corruption? Or is it just an underfunded system/government department?  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!  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 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.   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.   Are we effectively arguing that people pursuing high paying jobs, rather than taking up public roles is immoral? This is a pretty high burden to take - this means all high paying jobs are bad - bankers, doctors so on and so forth.  06:10  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Davian Hung |
| --- |

| **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. Let’s link this observation to the stance on our side - which is that 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.  Rebuttal   * Good model question; even if it is a choice, why don’t they just go into corporate law, or sports law, or any other field. Lawyers get to choose, post law school, which area they want to work in - if these people already choose something else, why would they now choose it, especially when being forced to. * We need to compare their model to ours - which is 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.   Don’t rebuild as a distinct issue; follow the structure of a response: what they say - why it isn’t true, why it isn’t important; the even if; then the comparative of what you get on your side - and then you do rebuilding there - and then weighing.  Argument 1   * Is this distinct from the responses/rebuilding? * Is getting paid well a motivation to do poorly? Is money the sole motivator to do well? Especially given that these lawyers choose to pursue public defense, and made an informed choice here? * On quitting and burnout, spell this out further; link it to your model in terms of uplifting public defense. * No difference in training, but yes to difference in resources. * 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? * Where is the positive analysis for why private defense attorneys are important and access to them must remain open.   We need to ask POIs - we have to do this more consistently. This is a bad habit we’ve developed and we need to break it stat!  06:14 | | | | | | |