| **Student Name:** AvaYao |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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 highlighting the harm your side wants to prevent; clearly delivered, give me slightly more eye contact here.  Set-up   * We don’t need to explain what a criminal trial is specifically, but rather explain why this debate is happening; we call this problem characterisation - you’re characterising the need for us to implement this policy; we technically do this when we explain what the distinction between private and public is. * Are we going to pump money into public defenders? At present, this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - is this the same system we’re now extending further?   Argument 1   * Clear thesis, don’t just jump into the celebrity/poor person example; we need to be more structural. This means we start by explaining why the quality of a lawyer is so valuable to the outcome of a trial - and then illustrate how it harms the poor disproportionally.   + Private lawyers 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. * The impact of this argument therefore is that when we do this, we take away this advantage the wealthy have.   Argument 2   * For this to be it’s own argument, it has to go beyond an explanation of the impact of the first argument; you need to explain 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.   This speech showcases more familiarity with 1st Prop - next time let’s do 1st Opp to get a little bit of rebuttal in.  03:51 - keep going next time!  We can still speak louder and faster!  Let’s ask POIs! We’ve seen how these work - now it’s our turn to do them! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  Clear opening highlighting 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   * Clear on what you do policy-implementation wise; but the specific mechanisms being used to uplift public defense beyond subsidies needs to be explained. * 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   Where is rebuttal?  Argument 1   * More justice - better experience and knowledge; does Prop disagree with this? Or do they agree, and just say it should not happen at all? * Clear on financial incentive to do a good job; but doesn’t this then mean that public defenders don’t have an incentive? * This argument needs to explain why on your side public defenders get better - they can’t on Proposition!   Argument 2   * Is this a practical or a principle? You need 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?   05:02  We need to pay attention to our flow + enunciation!  We have to ask POIs! Where are the consistent POIs? | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  Is this the reason why? Or are there other more pertinent and pressing issues at work, such as the lack of trust surrounding forensic evidence, or the racial tensions in LA at the time?  You have to punish Opp for not engaging with the harms of unfairness that your first speaker spends time on; they just say private lawyers are better - and that public defenders exist. You should point out that you agree and that is a problem. 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. The mechanism to correct the system + making it robust is missing.  Clear on unfairness. We need to be more structural. This means we start by explaining why the quality of a lawyer is so valuable to the outcome of a trial - and then illustrate how it harms the poor disproportionally.   * Private lawyers 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.   POI - make the trade off clearer; why are you okay with a lesser quality being employed, if it means more equal access?  You need to explain 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.  Did you have a second speaker argument?  05:04  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  They never engage with the increasing burden being put on public defenders - this is what is important for you to call out up top!  Rebuttal   * More justice - better experience and knowledge; does Prop disagree with this? Or do they agree, and just say it should not happen at all? * We eventually talk about more injustice because of more overworking - go into greater detail! First establish what the purpose of a trial is - what are we trying to understand? To establish guilt, to establish innocence etc. - if this can’t happen properly - what happens? * When we point out that they are overburdened, we need to explain why there is a path to improvement on our side. Our first speaker is clear on what you do policy-implementation wise; but the specific mechanisms being used to uplift public defense beyond subsidies needs to be explained further. 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   Argument 1   * This argument is very contingent on the world unfolding in a particular way; we can instead just start by saying we’ll characterise what it means to be a public defender, and then explain how because of their burden they already do ‘bad’ jobs; the solution is to fund them further, and not increase their case load. * In this case, explain what the purpose of the system is - and if it is to ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?   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.  05:17  We need to pay attention to our flow + enunciation!  We have to ask POIs more consistently, and make sure we’re wording them clearly and concisely! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Clear, strong tone up front, clear moral harm being spelled out!  Observations:   * You have to punish Opp for not engaging with the harms of unfairness that your first/second speaker spends time on; they just say private lawyers are better - and that public defenders exist. * You should point out that you agree and that is a problem. 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. * **The mechanism to correct the system + making it robust is missing. We call them out for this - but we don’t solve it either!** * It isn’t a contradiction, it’s just missing analysis - it’s criminal in that they aren’t ever to explain how they achieve the fairness of the criminal justice system, they just say that people have the right to spend the money they earn.   POI: This explanation is too late to come at third; this needed to be clear earlier, that as demand for private defenders declines, these people move to work in public defense; but also why is this true? Why don’t they go into corporate law instead?  Clash 1   * What is the thesis of this clash? What are you trying to prove here? * Clear on difference in capacity. We need to be more structural. This means we start by explaining why the quality of a lawyer is so valuable to the outcome of a trial - and then illustrate how it harms the poor disproportionally. * Private lawyers 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.   Clash 2   * What is the thesis of this clash? What are you trying to prove here? * Make the trade off clearer; why are you okay with a lesser quality being employed, if it means more equal access? * You need to explain 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.   05:07  We need to ask POIs more consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellen Lui |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Our hook is missing! We need to start by pushing a high impact observation - on where we’re winning/losing and so forth. For instance, it is that they tell us how we solve the shortage of public defenders is that private defenders move in - but why is this true? Renee just says this and provides no explanation - so a shortage still exists, they’re still overworked, this means that justice doesn’t get served!  The structure of a third speech should be opening, observations where needed, and then clashes! There should be 2-3 clashes - which are just the key issues of a round. Observe other third speakers in the debates we do to see how they all implement this!  We assert that there is a moral right to spend money in the ways people want - but why is this true? We needed to explain that 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.  POI: Explain why no one now gets justice! Depriving everyone of justice is not the solution forward. When we point out that they are overburdened, we need to explain why there is a path to improvement on our side. Our first speaker is clear on what you do policy-implementation wise; but the specific mechanisms being used to uplift public defense beyond subsidies needs to be explained further. 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 could explain how if the other side does this, the state can just shirk their burden and assign no further resources to this problem - but in our world, growing awareness of this disparity means action gets taken.  We eventually talk about more injustice because of more overworking - go into greater detail! First establish what the purpose of a trial is - what are we trying to understand? To establish guilt, to establish innocence etc. - if this can’t happen properly - what happens?  Did we end up saying the clash we specified earlier in the speech? We need to sort out the structure of our speech as clearly as possible!  04:56  We need to ask POIs! How many did we ask today? | | | | | | |