| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to 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:  We need to pinpoint HOW democracies are inefficient or ineffective - use an example to highlight this up top - for instance, elected officials feel a need to pander to oil and gas executives to help fund their campaigns, rather than leading a transition to green energy to help counter climate change. This will illustrate the problem you are trying to solve.  Set-up   * Good work highlighting the lack of knowledge and experience; explain to me why it isn’t sufficient for them to consult experts instead. Why must they be experts themselves? * Good work safeguarding checks and balances - but how will this choice occur? We have to ensure the way in which we’d implement this is super clear - for instance, objectives based governance, and where this isn’t met - we get rid of them or have performance reviews.   + You could establish clear, measurable, and publicly available metrics to assess the effectiveness of technocratic policies in achieving their stated goals.   + You could conduct regular performance evaluations of technocratic agencies and individuals based on these metrics. * I think we need to define what representation is - is it on the basis of symbolism - that is, I voted for this person, hence they represent me, or is it more meaningful - that is, they will do what is best for me.   Argument 1   * Clear claim and thesis up top! * On the social contract - we don’t want to cite this like a source, we want to establish what the deal or exchange between the state and the people is; explain how this is the compensation for not being able to choose the state - hence the condition of a state must be good; put a twist on the social contract. * We aren’t spending enough time establishing the duty of the state; and why the duty is best fulfilled in this manner!   Argument 2   * We must first establish the point of a government, then why the representative government does not meet it, and then why we do. We are describing both in throwaway lines, rather than spending time establishing comprehensively the nature of these actors. * What are the incentives of these actors? Why do they behave the way they do? What is the need for expertise? The mechanisation is missing! * At the end of this argument, what is the impact, outside of ‘efficiency’? What does it mean to be efficient, and why is it good?   We have to spend more time thinking through the analysis in our argument - the claims we’re making at present are too vague, and aren’t being spoken about specifically enough. Our POIs have to be more mindfully worded - they cannot involve summaries of what we said.  05:31 - you have to hit 6! More confident tone today, which is good! Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to 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:  Excellent tone up top; rather than saying they have no experience, explain how the vast majority of politicians do - and explain how they serve legislative terms prior to running for higher office; and where they don’t they can access experts as consultants. The secondary point to make is - does that matter as long as people choose and think that the person in question is doing a good job; this is where you bring in the Trump example!  Rebuttal - we need to have a clearer sense of organisation going into this, because this is slightly messy; have responses to set-up in your own set-up as you recharacterise what the debate is about, then respond to the first argument, then the second - and then move on. You’re merging lots of stuff together.   * Don’t rebut through examples. This doesn’t prove anything! * On set-up, the biggest thing to challenge is checks and balances; what happens when technocrats go wrong? If we can kick them out - does it remain a technocracy? * The point we need to make is what a representative democracy is, or what the purpose of government is! * POI - I’m confused - on the Republicans favouring Republicans - doesn’t this problem also exist on your side?   Argument 1   * I buy they aren’t representative - why is this good? Why won’t issues be addressed? Why don’t they care - isn’t their job to fix problems? We are just asserting the ways in which they will behave? * On incentives to do better through competition - why do they have the capacity to do better? You’re providing a singular incentive as to how behaviour is good!   Argument 2   * Did we prove anything within this argument?   We needed to run a principle argument, on the purpose of government! That it is not simply to achieve optimal efficiency or technical solutions. It's to safeguard the rights and well-being of its citizens, promote the common good, and ensure a just and equitable society. This involves balancing competing interests, navigating diverse values, and making decisions that reflect the will of the people. Only elected representatives can do this - not technocrats. Point out the kind of decisions technocrats will make such that they cannot achieve this! For instance, elected reps have to balance the often conflicting interests of various groups within society. A technocrat might recommend cutting funding for arts programs to maximize investment in STEM education, disregarding the cultural value and social benefits of the arts.  Good confident tone! Good control over flow.  06:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to 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! What is the way in which elected democracies work? This is vague!  Rebuttal - our rebuttals are to bits and pieces of their claims, rather than being more comprehensive! Break down the Opp case into 2-3 points, and then deal with each - this makes sure you cover more ground.   * Explain how they were bad - explain how they were caught up in ideological wars and tribalism - rather than objective based governance. The way to do this is not to say memes existed of how bad they were, but to highlight the state of the economy, politics and such. * Good example of Trump and bankruptcy - point out how elections don’t measure competence, and people don’t vote on the basis of competence! We need to make it clear HOW democracies don’t work.   We only spent 2.5 minutes on rebuttal!  POI - explain what kind of expertise! Give examples of the kind of people who become technocrats. This is a gap in set-up you need to address. For instance, a welfare economist as head of welfare - you can use the very examples we discussed in class!  Argument 1   * Is this new or different from your first speaker? * What do you mean - more influence is better? Are all countries following a two party system? Is it true no pressure exists? * We need to break down what people vote on, and why this leads to bad candidates being chosen!   + Voters could be misinformed, prioritise short term gains, choose candidates on the basis of party affiliation, be misled etc. * Explain why expertise even matters! What are the policies of an elected representative versus a technocrat? This is still unclear at the end of this claim! For instance, technocrats prioritize preventative care and public health initiatives based on epidemiological data, even if these measures are initially unpopular or require significant upfront investment. May advocate for cost-effectiveness analysis and evidence-based treatment protocols.   We must first establish the point of a government, then why the representative government does not meet it, and then why we do. We are describing both in throwaway lines, rather than spending time establishing comprehensively the nature of these actors. What are the incentives of these actors? Why do they behave the way they do? What is the need for expertise? The mechanisation is missing!  We have to spend more time thinking through the analysis in our argument - the claims we’re making at present are too vague, and aren’t being spoken about specifically enough.  06:12 - good on time!  More confident tone today, which is good! Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers a world where technocrats run the government, compared to 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 call out on expertise - explain why it doesn’t matter. We just point out it doesn’t, rather than breaking down why it doesn’t. Why is it untrue? Deal with it up top - and then move onto the rest of your speech.  Rebuttal - our rebuttals are to bits and pieces of their claims, rather than being more comprehensive! Break down the Prop case into 2-3 points, and then deal with each - this makes sure you cover more ground.   * On experts - explain HOW or WHY all elected officials have access to expert views, and have incentives to listen to them - and why it still needs to be those who have been elected who are in the driving seat.   + Point out that elected officials derive their legitimacy from the will of the people. They are accountable to the public through elections and other democratic mechanisms. This ensures that they remain responsive to public concerns and can be removed from office if they fail to meet expectations.   + Importantly - policy decisions often involve balancing competing values and interests. Elected officials are better positioned to navigate these trade-offs and make decisions that reflect the broader societal context.   Argument 1   * What is the value of leadership and soft skills? What kind of soft skills? Our argument cannot rely on a very vague explanation of leadership and soft skills - you have to be specific and grounded! We have to establish the different roles/personas elected officials have to be - and why elections are the only mechanism through which we can ensure this all occurs. Then explain why technocracy can never achieve this - and then what the impact of this is! * POI - ask them what they do. How are technocrats held accountable? Push them on the comparative!   We needed to run a principle argument, on the purpose of government! That it is not simply to achieve optimal efficiency or technical solutions. It's to safeguard the rights and well-being of its citizens, promote the common good, and ensure a just and equitable society. This involves balancing competing interests, navigating diverse values, and making decisions that reflect the will of the people. Only elected representatives can do this - not technocrats. Point out the kind of decisions technocrats will make such that they cannot achieve this! For instance, elected reps have to balance the often conflicting interests of various groups within society. A technocrat might recommend cutting funding for arts programs to maximize investment in STEM education, disregarding the cultural value and social benefits of the arts.  We need to be more mindful about our flow and enunciation/pronunciation.  05:37 - we need to hit 6  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |