| **Student Name:** Christy Yuan |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Is our opening as confident as we want it to be? Our opening should try to highlight WHY it is better than representative democracy, as opposed to just saying that it is. We have to have a specific problem characterisation.  Set-up   * Do we need to acknowledge it’s an ideology, rather than an implemented system? * What is a technocracy? What is a representative democracy? How do we choose these technocrats, and what checks and balances exist? Give examples of the kind of people who become technocrats. You can use the very examples we discussed in class! * 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. * Our burden isn’t to highlight that the possibility of harm exists, it is that it **does** and we need to change this!   Argument 1   * Why do experts know more? What is the role of expertise or knowledge in the decision-making of politicians? * What better ideas? Why can’t elected officials come up with these? We are trying to solve a problem - but we never explain what the problem is; as a result all our pros are just potential benefits, as opposed to a case being made as to why technocracy is the only way forward. * 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. * What situation? What is happening such that expertise might be needed?   Argument 2   * Better for the country in general - is this new or different to the first argument? * Why do elected officials behave in this way? You need to explain to me what exactly the nature of a politician is, or the kind of election campaigning that occurs.   + For instance, what are the priorities of voters? What kind of issues do they vote on? Is it policies, is it personality, are these voters even informed?   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.  04:58 - We have to ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tony Huang |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Why would technocracy lead to this? We’re making a fairly extreme claim here, and we better be able to explain why this is where it leads to!  Did we have set-up and rebuttal?  We needed to engage in clear and systematic set-up!   * Rather than a literal definition, point out what the characteristics of a representative democracy are that we want to preserve. * We should pinpoint what the purpose of government is! Is it to make the ‘best’ decisions - and what even are these? Or is it representation and accountability? * We should try to co-opt their benefits of expertise. For instance, explain how elected officials have access to experts, and use their expertise when making decisions; but that the actual decision must lie in the hands of someone who people choose.   Argument 1   * What is the central claim of this argument? What is the impact of this argument? Do we prove it? * Why would bribes happen? Lobbying and special interest funding occurs on your side; if anything, elected officials are MORE likely to be susceptible to moneyed interests!   Argument 2   * Why would it turn out that they’re a racist? Why would this happen?   Argument 3   * On efficiency - it is far more likely that their side achieves this! We don’t explain or establish what the nature of an elected official is, a technocrat is, what the purpose of government is, and then the decisions that are made - and why they are better.   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.  04:06 - we spoke a minute under time!  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Our opening is louder, and said with more purpose. This is good! We need to make sure we are making eye contact throughout this! Our opening should be more specific and rebuttal oriented, the current observation isn’t adding anything of strategic value to the round.  Rebuttal   * Ask where opinions are more likely to clash; in a conversation between experts, or elected officials who need to win elections? We need to explain WHY representative democracy is fundamentally broken. For instance - that it is caught up in ideological wars and tribalism - rather than objective based governance. The way to do this is to highlight the state of the economy, politics and such. POI: the same comment here applies. * Let’s machine gun take them down; on racism, on bribes - how likely is this. * Good on choosing well - but how do you choose? Is this covered in the set-up from first, or do we need to fill this gap?   + The point we need to make is why there are checks and balances. 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.   Argument 1   * Good identifying specialised knowledge is what is your unique advantage. We need to explain why this knowledge is necessary in the making of good decisions. * 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.   POI: the answer here is to explain what checks and balances exist. There is a way to get rid of them.  Argument 2   * What do we mean by justified political decisions? We could explain why elected officials are also structurally incentivised to make popular decisions, rather than the ones which lead to change. Covid-19 is a good example of this. Why were governments like Singapore and Hong Kong better at dealing with the spread of the virus, over the UK - because the latter failed to take decisive action that would limit mobility - because people would get angry!   05:14  Let’s ask POIs consistently! Don’t take two POIs in a five minute speech. | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Rather than saying they’ll be dictators, explain WHY this would happen. Point out their lack of explanation on checks and balances and what happens when technocrats make the wrong decisions. Why is it valuable that the voices of a country be heard?  Rebuttal   * Don’t go speaker by speaker! Go issue by issue! * Efficiency - why are they unable to come to these decisions? Why would the experts disagree? Would politicians do a better job here? We’re just asserting all of this to be true - but we need to explain all of this! * Lack of representation - why is this bad? If there are major consequences, why are they being talked about later, as opposed to now? If it’s such a big deal - you need to make a big deal out of it!   Argument 1   * Why is this true? Why do larger groups mean less disagreement, why would technocrats disagree more? We assert all of this to be true - but this isn’t! You have to explain WHY this is true in the first place. * Good on how we can’t vote them out - we say this negatively impacts a community, but what does this mean? * We needed to analyse the purpose of the 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. * Why do people migrate? Why is the option they have?   You can also argue that elected officials have access to experts, and can make informed decisions - 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.  05:21  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Isabella Sun |
| --- |

| **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 confident opening, but we’re just reading from our paper, with no hand gestures. Our language needs to be more appropriate - you can’t say that people are ‘dumb’ and make bad decisions. You have to explain WHY this is true. We need to explain WHY representative democracy is fundamentally broken. For instance - that it is caught up in ideological wars and tribalism - rather than objective based governance. The way to do this is to highlight the state of the economy, politics and such.  Clash 1 - Practicality   * We need to establish how decisions are made in a representative democracy; don’t say people are dumb, but that voters make bad decisions - on the basis of lots of things; misinformation, short term incentives, being overwhelmed with information, lacking an education and so forth. * Explain how or why elections lead to less practical decisions! We could explain why elected officials are also structurally incentivised to make popular decisions, rather than the ones which lead to change. Covid-19 is a good example of this. Why were governments like Singapore and Hong Kong better at dealing with the spread of the virus, over the UK - because the latter failed to take decisive action that would limit mobility - because people would get angry! * Ask where opinions are more likely to clash; in a conversation between experts, or elected officials who need to win elections?     Clash 2 - what is the title of this clash?   * On caring about citizens - don’t say we ignore them! We need to explain why checks and balances do exist on our side - so why we don’t get corruption; 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. * Good on bribes happening. We could argue that lobbying and special interests are more likely to manifest on the other side!   05:09 - well done!  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  I don’t want to see you on Poe/using AI in prep again. This is unacceptable, and will make you complacent and dependent on it, rather than using your own critical thinking skills! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  We’re reading our opening. We need to make sure there is a clear, tangible, upshot to our opening. At the moment, it is just observations about the debate, without any comment on why this is important or matters.  The structure of a third speech should only be opening, clash 1, clash 2, and conclusion. You may want to add strategic observations or clarifications before your clashes, where needed. We spend time summarising what we said, then what they said, and then clashes?  On bribery - why is this likely to happen? Why won’t this happen more on your side? Surely lobby groups have an easier time getting to elected officials, than technocrats?  Why would experts behave in the way that you claim? Why are they able to ignore what people want? We rightfully identify politicians know or care more about people - but why is this what leads to better decisions? We can’t assume that this is just what a better decision is.  On urgency - why would the experts disagree with each other? Would politicians do a better job here? We’re just asserting all of this to be true - but we need to explain all of this!  Clash - the title needs to be short and simple, and phrased as a question!  We needed to analyse the purpose of the 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.   You can also argue that elected officials have access to experts, and can make informed decisions - 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.  05:21 - we just started rapping in the end!  We have to ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today? | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Don’t start your speech with a judge! Our opening isn’t very clear in terms of what should happen; they’ve made it clear these are pretty reliable people. The point to focus on is that there are no checks and balances on their side/that expertise isn’t what it takes to achieve good decision-making.  When treating reply as third, keep to the structure of third! The structure of a third speech should only be opening, clash 1, clash 2, and conclusion. You may want to add strategic observations or clarifications before your clashes, where needed.  Clash 1   * Why would experts behave in the way that you claim? Why are they able to ignore what people want? We rightfully identify politicians know or care more about people - but why is this what leads to better decisions? We can’t assume that this is just what a better decision is. * We need to first establish what a good decision is, or what a good political leader is!   + We can argue that the purpose of government 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. * Who’s more likely to fight with each other? Politicians or experts? I want you to consider if your claims sound realistic!   You can also argue that elected officials have access to experts, and can make informed decisions - 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.  05:20 - we just started rapping in the end!  We have to ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today? | | | | | | |