| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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! Don’t say it’s so absurd - say it is unacceptable, and that’s why we support abolishing executive pardons. Don’t bend down during your opening, it hurts gravitas. You need to make eye contact with the audience instead; write bigger!  Set-up - this is too wordy, and slightly excessive. We need to be more efficient with our word economy.   * You don’t have to go into this much detail with regards to changing sentencing - you need to frame this as the world changing and hence us understanding that sentencing needs to change. * Why does the President get to have this request? If their party is in power, they get this, if not they don’t - what does this achieve? Why is this distinct from other checks and balances that may also be susceptible to influence by polarisation or special interests? See the POI Adrian asks you. * Why will it be inherently abusive; we have to establish why the potential for abuse will always exist - and how this undermines public trust in the justice system.   Why are these new laws likely to pass, especially in the context of the United States? I need you to explain how either public appetite has shifted, and now views laws like mandatory minimums as unfair, or why there is top down incentive to institute change.  Transition from set-up to first argument is not very clear. Slow down when these shifts happen!  Argument 1   * You need to establish why abuse is going to always happen.   + The pardon power can be easily manipulated for political gain, allowing executives to shield allies from prosecution, obstruct justice, or reward political favors. This politicization undermines the principle of equal justice under the law and erodes public confidence in the impartiality of the legal system.   + The perception, even if unfounded, that pardons are granted based on political connections rather than merit, significantly damages the integrity of the justice system. * We have to explain what the process of justice, under the court system, is, that is far more accountable and transparent, compared to the pardon process - which is shrouded in secrecy, with decisions made without clear justification or public input. * We need to analyse further why this individual not being a random person and the highest authority in the land engaging in this behaviour sets a bad precedent, with regards to certain individuals or crimes being above reproach; you cite the Trump cases and special interest, but we need to characterise this as bipartisan - that Obama did it, that Clinton did it too.   05:57  Our movement during our speech has improved significantly, but still needs effort from us! Make more eye contact. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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:  Excellent POI to Ryan.  Good call out but the phrasing needs to be cleaner; it is that they still suffer from the harms of polarisation and special interest. Bring back your POI and then move on.  On signposting, don’t go into such detail re saying a model, then framing etc. Rebuttal has to come AFTER set-up. We need to know what the comparative will be first.  Rebuttal   * Less knowledge; this isn’t true. A full office to process clemency requests exists - we talked about this! On set-up; you need to establish why there are checks and balances such that this is used well. For instance, deterrence, reputation etc. On regulation, your side doesn’t get to have this, because the idea of a final check external from other branches goes away. If they can be regulated, this no longer remains the final safety net. * You have to challenge whether or not the organic change on sentencing legislation they present as a counter-model as well will be viable at all.   Argument 1   * Premise of the argument needs to be spelled out up top, rather than jumping into the Vietnam example. * Excellent argument idea - explain why this is a unique solution to this, and why the executive has to take this action. * How do they use it in check; don’t talk about this happening hypothetically but rather explain to me what incentives exist for presidents to use it for this reason. * Why is this a unique fix to the problems you are describing? Why is it that no other function in the government can create this check and balance?   Argument 2   * What has happened such that they have been given harsh sentences, or incorrect sentences? Characterise status quo, especially from more conservative or tough on crime states. * Even if we discount politicisation, we can argue that courts apply the law strictly based on legal statutes and binding precedents, and as such have limited ability to deviate from mandatory sentencing guidelines or established jurisprudence. * When extenuating circumstances are overlooked—or if post-trial revelations indicate a miscarriage of justice—the pardon power provides a fail-safe mechanism. * We need to analyse the nature of CJS, explain how this is particularly bad in specific states, where they have indulged in putting people on the death penalty / capital punishment - and that a more liberal executive can act as a check against this.   06:02 - don’t have abrupt endings. Give proper conclusions! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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! You need to make eye contact for full gravitas and impact. This has to be a mic drop moment, but can’t be because you KEEP GOING. Use pauses to break this up.  We have to FRAME why executive pardons are used in the case of special interests, and why they will always be. We have to establish why the **potential for abuse will always exist - and how this undermines public trust in the justice system.** Analyse that this isn’t just a singular person - this is the highest authority in the land! Engaging in this behaviour sets a bad precedent, with regards to certain individuals or crimes being above reproach; you cite the Trump cases and special interest, but we need to characterise this as bipartisan - that Obama did it, that Clinton did it too.  Rebuttal   * Explain how this is a hypothetical benefit - they need to prove why it would be used in this way for this benefit to materialise. Explain how at the end of term, executives lose scrutiny as a disincentive on acting out. Go into the comparative! What system of justice do we prefer instead? Why would the judiciary behave in a perfectly reasonable manner?   + We have to explain what the process of justice, under the court system, is, that is far more accountable and transparent, compared to the pardon process - which is shrouded in secrecy, with decisions made without clear justification or public input.   + The perception, even if unfounded, that pardons are granted based on political connections rather than merit, significantly damages the integrity of the justice system. * On biases - you need to rescue your model from the challenges Adrian has; if their party is in power, they get this, if not they don’t - what does this achieve? Why is this distinct from other checks and balances that may also be susceptible to influence by polarisation or special interests? See the POI Adrian asks Ryan.   Extensions - it’s unclear when you truly move on, because during your extension, you suddenly start rebuttal.   * We needed to prove why the legislative changes we wanted would be able to come about. Why are these new laws likely to pass, especially in the context of the United States? I need you to explain how either public appetite has shifted, and now views laws like mandatory minimums as unfair, or why there is top down incentive to institute change. * Good rhetoric on who actually receives a pardon - use examples here! We watched a full video detailing these! Good on scale; this is where you have to introduce the comparative, which you are leaving under-developed.   Annabel, you have to stop reading, and you need to introduce pauses to your speech. It is hurting comprehension, because your content starts to muddle up together.  We cannot just stop speaking! You have to properly conclude.  06:02 | | | | | | |