| **Student Name:** Ava |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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 line. A little more eye contact and confidence would be better. There is some level of confusion visible while defining the motion - this can be overcome with better mental preparation in the pre time.  Context of Public Defenders   * The points are quite basic. Instead, its better that you simply highlight the failures of private defenders during your argument.   Argument   * Example of Kardashians: When you say one has a higher chance, its better to show examples as to why that’s the case. Talk about how they can give more time, they’re more competent, they’re not underpaid, they are more likely to collude (unfair/mal-practices), etc. A good illustration of what private defenders do is extremely important here.   Argument   * When you say public defenders can work well or that they are an option, you must acknowledge that in the current system, the efficiency of public defenders seem low. How do you address that? Without this preampetive, the case remains incomplete.   I suggest you make better utilisation of the time provided to you. The overall speech was quite short, while many more points could be covered.  Time:\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Opp 1 |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 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:  Good job sign posting the arguments. The very start of the speech, however, could be clearer - there are hints of unusual pauses.  The weaknesses of public defenders could be illustrated better. For example: do public defenders match the qualifications of private defenders? How underpaid are they? To what degree has their efficiency been compromised? Will it get worse for them on the proposition side?  When you argue that private defenders can work better, you must directly engage with prop’s stance. When you respond to it later, you are missing out on an important opportunity to engage with the prop’s most crucial points.  The argument that they can provide ‘better justice’, must acknowledge   * Why is your side fine with this opportunity limited to a few? * Is the current system fair? * Doesn’t this confirm prop’s argument that some will have better access to justice than others? The lack of comparative compromises the impact of this argument.   I think its an important responsibility on your side to show how you make things better without forcing all sides to have public defenders. Is there a way to improve public defenders efficiency such that they come close to private defenders in terms of competence? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name: Prop 2** |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 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:  Great command at the start of the speech. Try linking the opening example directly with your thesis. Furthermore, there seems to be a sense of confusion during sign posting.  The idea that some can afford while others cannot has already come from your side. It is important that you illustrate this further. What sort of things can private defenders do that public defenders cannot besides the idea that one can offer more time than the other.  The assumption that a murderer with private lawyer has a chance at going free requires more justification. This argument exists in an assumption that private defenders have enormous capacity to manipulate within the system. This cannot be convincing with pragmatics as to how that happens, or incorporate examples which suggests that it has.  Good work taking the POI. The response wasn’t direct. It was a technical question, a technical answer is recommended. It is very important to preempt from the start: what happens when all defenders are public defenders? Will efficiency improve as compared to the status quo? If not, then we’re just giving bad lawyers to everyone, which may not be a desirable solution. How does your side help in improving public defenders competence/funding/efficiency? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Opp 2 |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 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:  Rebuttals   * Wealth Gap: The response is in the right direction. However, you’re spending a lot of time repeating their claim + telling what they didn’t do. Good job identifying that good lawyers doesn’t directly mean a win, however, please explain this better. What does this pragmatically look like? * Public Defenders Will be More Overworked: This is a reasonable point to bring. But keep in mind that you must acknowledge that if you want to defend the status quo, you have to show some positive aspects. You cannot fully concede that public defenders are bad, or will be bad even after reforms.   Arguments   * The idea that they are tired to work is very repeated. There seems to be a lack of new substantive material in the speech. * The idea of subsidy is interesting. Must illustrate further to make it substantial. * When you talk about people who are underprivileged being helped within your new plan, I’m not sure how this is different from the status quo, since public defenders are assigned to also those that cannot afford the alternative.   I think you can work more on coming up with arguments distinct from one another. I would recommend you not be stuck on a cycle of repetition. The ideas had good potential, however, they need much more illustration. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Prop 3 |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 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:  Commanding start. Keep it up.  Rebuttals   * The idea that private lawyers can help people get away with things has come several times in the speech. This requires more technical explanation, or examples to show what it means in the real world. * Most responses go back to your principle stance. Think more about the impacts/outcomes, and utilize them as rebuttals. * The point about subsidy wasn’t tackled well. It is unclear from your side too as to how you view the subject of subsidy.   Good job taking the POI  Comparison   * The idea of fair trial and ‘same circumstances, once again goes back to the same argument. The attempt does not help in weighing this argument with that of the opposition. * The opposition had brought up technical points about how public defenders will be more overworked - this must be compared well. * The idea that ‘fairness’ is more on side prop is a reasonable one. However, how does your side, practically, solve more problems? You can reinforce the points of your side, or provide examples to restate them. The point, as it stands, seems quite repetitive. * A good summary of what your side provides in terms of impact is something to focus on. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Opp 3 |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 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:  Rebuttals   * Good job showing the comparison with public and private education. Though I feel these sort of analogy should come earlier, I would say it did add value to your rebuttals. * Rest of the rebuttals in general suffer from repetition. There doesn’t seem to be an added interpretation of the prop’s case as you respond to their ideas.   Clashes/Comparisons   * There seems to be a lot of confusion while comparing your ideas with that of the prop. Think about basic comparatives!   + Which side gives better support to the vulnerable?   + Which side produces better efficiency among lawyers in overall?   + Which side is better for those seeking justice? * The idea that people should have the right to choose - personal autonomy is the basic stance of your side. There is a level if interpretation that is necessary. | | | | | | |