| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  Our opening needs to be as clear and confident as possible. Good identification of efficiency as important - but we need to illustrate why it doesn't exist in Opp’s world, and why it is valuable. Use examples such as COVID-19, or during a natural disaster.  Set-up   * Good work establishing that checks and balances still exist, but we cannot fiat that there will be no polarisation and no tribalism. Rather, it is that decision-making will not be crippled by these two things, which means Opp must defend long drawn out processes. * We need to establish what the characteristics of centralisation are! For instance, that there is speed and efficiency in decision-making, a clear chain of command, coordinated responses to crises. * We need to explain why there are natural incentives for some elements of accountability to exist. For instance, consulting experts on economic issues, or deciding on bills elected representatives have presented and worked on in the first place.   Argument 1   * We need to first establish what the nature of democracies increasingly is - how are different branches behaving? Why would they block each other, under conditions of both good will and malintent - for instant, genuine disagreements on socio-economic status, or political tribalism. Don’t assert that this just happens, explain how it is happening instead! * What is the cost of not having efficiency? You need to spell out how efficiency is valuable when making decisions - so as to highlight why this is the metric by which we must measure which government is good and which is not. Why is efficiency consistently the most important factor in what decisions the state should take. * What kind of harm might be done while these representatives sit around?   Argument 2   * Rather than focusing on the social contract, explain how there will be checks and balances instead. The point we want to make is that these are elected individuals at the end of the day, who do not want protests or push back from people. There are some boundaries and parameters that exist. * What are the incentives of heads of state? Why are they concerned for instance, by re-election incentive, such that they will not abuse their power?   We’re not presenting very confidently! We barely make eye contact, and sound unsure when we speak. We do sound like we’re reading for a fair chunk of the speech. Confidence is a choice! Even our POI is asked in such a soft voice.  05:03 - try and extend to 6 next time!  Let’s ask POIs consistently and frequently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  If our problem is that there will be an abuse of power, we need to say this clearly and explicitly - and explain why the checks that 1P highlights in both set-up and arguments don’t work. We don’t engage with this at all!  Set-up   * What are separate branches, what checks and balances exist? How will laws be passed in your world? What kind of debate or discourse would exist in the legislature? Give me examples of countries or contexts in which this occurs.   Rebuttal   * Is it untrue that debate doesn’t hold up decision-making? Our response is that localised law making will occur. Does this challenge the claim the other side is making? This is just an assertion in another direction; it is also not a reflection of how the legislature would work in your world. * Which of the analysis Prop presents did we actually disprove by the end of our responses? We need to explain why a slower process, and the disagreement Angela references, doesn’t harm, but rather checks against more extreme heads of state like Trump. The point is - their benefit is contingent on the President or head of state being reasonable.   Argument 1   * Why will these laws pass? You’re basically arguing for each representative having executive authority in their areas - but that’s not how the legislature works, based on the discussion we had earlier. If we’re confused or unclear, we need to ask so we don’t prep in the wrong direction next time. * If the point we’re making is states deciding for themselves, polarisation and tribalism still exists at the state level. This is also a debate about national politics, rather than state wide politics. We didn’t engage at all on the national level.   Argument 2   * Here, the point we needed to make is that centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.   Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so low; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. Point out how your side SOLVES this problem - for instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world?  05:54 - we need to speak with more confidence, and ask POIs more frequently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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 needed to call out Opp for not engaging at all with the context your side presents on polarisation or tribalism. The call out on local problems is good, but we should clarify - this is not a debate about state decisions, but about national decisions. Their argument only stands in the state level.  Rebuttal   * Good call out on lack of engagement. Good work asking about whether this is mutually exclusive! Reinforce why politicians, even under a centralised system, have incentives to listen to people! Elections still exist, the free media still exists, there are natural incentives for some elements of accountability to exist. For instance, consulting experts on economic issues, or deciding on bills elected representatives have presented and worked on in the first place. * POI: explain how this assumes that those opinions get translated into policy; no one ever agrees such that this gets represented. Expression of opinion versus opinion inspiring legislation that actually passes are two different things. * We need to establish the comparative - which is that there would be bureaucratic delays or disagreements. We need to explain why this would not exist in the counterfactual, so explaining incentives to disagree and hold up decisions, diversity in views, polarisation and tribalism as we talked about in class!   Argument 1   * What is the cost of not having efficiency? You need to spell out how efficiency is valuable when making decisions - so as to highlight why this is the metric by which we must measure which government is good and which is not. Why is efficiency consistently the most important factor in what decisions the state should take. You need to impact which government functions get held up, and why they are so valuable. * On one party being powerful - sure, but how does this lower tribalism/polarisation? The point to make here is that where all branches are aligned under a single authority, there's less opportunity for conflicting messages to emerge and exacerbate divisions. You need to analyse why polarisation or tribalism exists, and how this deals with those root causes. * Good on the role of the super-majority and Supreme Court. Explain how these are good, independent checks. The comparative being under explained means the sheer importance of this impact is under-executed.   We need to ask POIs consistently!  Good tone! We are sounding more and more like a debater.  06:10 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Karin Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers. |
| --- |

| 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:  Helping our society and advancing as a whole is too vague. Attack the claims from Prop instead, explaining why they cannot have the convenient centralisation while also having great checks and balances. Explain why they have to pick one.  Rebuttal   * We need to explain why conflicts do not take as long as Prop claims, rather than saying conflicts can teach us ‘things’ - what things, why are they valuable? Why is this knowledge gained MORE IMPORTANT than speed? You need to engage with the point being made! * Why is this diversity of opinion important, and why is it impossible for the Prop to access this? How does this diversity of opinion translate into law? How does your side get these laws passed, as opposed to them getting stuck in the legislature under endless debate! * We needed to spend more time engaging with their arguments on efficiency, the social contract, and polarisation. We only engaged with parts of the analysis within each argument, not the central claim being made in any of them!   Argument 1   * We need to establish what context their argument is contingent on - the point is - their benefit is contingent on the President or head of state being reasonable. We need to explain why a slower process, and the disagreements and conflicts Prop references, don’t harm, but rather checks against more extreme heads of state like Trump. * POI - why would a supermajority overturn the executive’s decision cause chaos, but the separation of power on your side wouldn’t?   Argument 2   * Why would it occur in this manner? * Explain why the standards of accountability on Prop are so low; why it is so easy to get away with decisions - explain how centralisation occurs, in terms of how the power of courts is diminished, or impeachment requires politicians to overlook their political affiliations, especially under a polarised political environment. Point out how your side SOLVES this problem - for instance, explain how when Trump challenged the election in 2020, independent courts maintained democratic integrity; what would have happened in their world?   Here, the point we needed to make is that centralisation ignores what the people want; this is the state overstepping. Separate branches, particularly a legislature, allow for greater citizen participation and representation. Different voices and perspectives can be heard and considered in the policy-making process, leading to more democratic and responsive governance.  We have to sound more assertive when we speak! We sound like we’re just reading out the material on our paper.  06:08 - we didn’t ask a single POI today! | | | | | | |