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

| **Motion**: This house would introduce a minimum racial quota in the police force |
| --- |

| 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:  Why are we starting with ladies and gentlemen? The rest of the opening is good! Good focus on the delivery of justice. Don’t read though - it hurts the persuasiveness and impact of your opening.  Clear model; but we need to explain if we’ll do anything else - will we change training, will we change the equipment carried or tactics used?  We should spend time curating the problem - link it specifically to the problem of racism as a consequence of a lack of diversity in the police force. Why is the lack of diversity the defining cause for brutality?  Argument 1   * Is it as simple as more white people = racist, less white people = less racist? You can’t just magic the racism away by increasing diversity of the police force. * We need to set up a clear thesis, and layers of analysis for this argument to ensure we’re doing step by step analysis towards a specific outcome. * We need to establish how brutality occurs as a consequence of racial homogeneity; how does this subconscious discrimination manifest?   + Is it just a superiority complex, or is it the entrenchment of racism in crime statistics, is it that they see them as problems that need to be solved?   + Explain why this mindset persists; is it because they don’t engage with POC outside of handling them as criminals? * On the community - this is an impact; trust increases when the change in tactics and behaviour occurs. * Good use of examples from the class! Why do we care about their reputation, rather than their delivery of care? * Does crime increase when the police are seen as more brutal? In order for this line of analysis to work, you need to first consider why crime is even committed in the first place? * Don’t say ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’!   Why do the opinions of these new officers get respected? Won’t it be a racist, hostile workplace? Why and how do these opinions get reflected in policies or operating protocols? We need to explain how we’ll pair this policy with changes in training, communication, de-escalation techniques etc.   * + Explain how it may help break down stereotypes and foster empathy and respect.   + Explain how these minority officers may serve as advocates for their communities, and hence can bring attention to problems that may be otherwise overlooked.   Why is this an exclusive solution? Why is the quota the only way to achieve any of the impacts you talk about? Why are organic hiring efforts insufficient?  05:00 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would introduce a minimum racial quota in the police force |
| --- |

| 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:  We are reading Isabella. Is this a speech, or is this a reading exercise? Even if we read, we should put more energy into our voice; sound like you’re having a conversation with your friend!  Set-up   * Is the biggest concern we want to start with is how this harms white people who want to be cops? We should instead call out racial diversity; immediately point to training, equipment and militarisation; explain what the root cause is immediately, if calling them out for not addressing it. We eventually say this, but the judge is already confused by the first statement you had. * Good on training courses - explain why this lack of training is what has led to brutality in the first place. This is what leads to your exchange in the POI with Tony. You can also co-opt their benefits by doubling organic hiring efforts; don’t need to create a quota specifically.   Rebuttal   * ‘Which is very very cool’ - is this a response, or even language that we can use in a debate speech? * Challenge if racial diversity just does away with systemic racism. We should question how this is going to be implemented! Will it occur meaningfully, or will it occur in a tokenistic fashion?   + Ask why organic hiring isn’t happening, or can’t happen; then you can say that this may mean we have a less meritocratic approach, which drives an impression that these new officers of colour are underqualified, perpetuating hate and discrimination further.   + Ask if police officers just become less racist because they mix with people of colour. Presumably they already do? Even if they don’t, why do these people of colour mix well with the existing force? Why do their opinions change/why do the suggestions of these new officers going to be integrated into the policies? * Most of our rebuttals end with ‘I’ll address this later’ - address it now! * We spent far too much time on set-up and rebuttal - this is because we spoke incredibly slowly at the start.   Argument 1 (4:31)   * In a debate about police brutality, the objective on both sides is to be the one that solves police brutality. We instead focused on the people who lose out because of this quota. Presumably, Proposition has an incentive to do this well, because if they don’t there will be backlash or further racism, hence it won’t be done unfairly.   Argument 2 (5:11)   * We just say training leads to better policing. We don’t explain why the lack is what leads to it. We need to note why even if we have racial diversity, without training/proper resources, brutality continues, because even people of colour can also be negligible - rephrase the first layer of this argument into talking about how systemic racism works - and how training and tactics are the issue - highlight the harm done, and then point to your counterfactual.   06:00 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would introduce a minimum racial quota in the police force |
| --- |

| 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:  You need to immediately deal with what the causality of police brutality is/or why even if the cause isn’t racism of individual officers/the police force - the only implementable policy/possible policy is the one you support.  Rebuttal   * On the lack of fairness - explain why it will be done meritocratically.   + Why is representation not possible at the moment? Is organic hiring of diverse officers possible? Is it that the police self-select/is discriminatory in hiring? Characterising this means Opp can’t just say POC will progress when lacking the credentials; you can say they do - they just get rejected. * On training - you can do this too! On this not working - explain that they know deescalation, they just gut react in situations with POC because they don’t see them as human - then link it to what your side achieves. * It’s not that minorities can be racist, but about familiarity and empathy. Explain how these minority officers may serve as advocates for their communities, and hence can bring attention to problems that may be otherwise overlooked.   + What does it mean for things to be balanced out?   Argument 1   * Why do the opinions of these new officers get respected? Won’t it be a racist, hostile workplace? Why and how do these opinions get reflected in policies or operating protocols?   + Explain how it may help break down stereotypes and foster empathy and respect. * We need to establish how brutality occurs as a consequence of racial homogeneity; how does this subconscious discrimination manifest?   + Is it just a superiority complex, or is it the entrenchment of racism in crime statistics, is it that they see them as problems that need to be solved?   + Explain why this mindset persists; is it because they don’t engage with POC outside of handling them as criminals? How does this then change in your world? * Good use of examples from class to showcase the harm you attempt to safeguard from - but the mechanisation is missing; why do white officers feel like they now have to be able to justify their actions to these new police officers?   Why is this an exclusive solution? Why is the quota the only way to achieve any of the impacts you talk about? Why are organic hiring efforts insufficient?  We need to ask POIs more consistently!  06:010 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would introduce a minimum racial quota in the police force |
| --- |

| 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:  How many POIs did we ask today?  Rebuttal   * Good call out on lack of mechanisation within the claim on racism. Break this down immediately; point to training, equipment and militarisation; explain what the root cause is immediately, if calling them out for not addressing it.   + Ask if police officers just become less racist because they mix with people of colour. Presumably they already do? Even if they don’t, why do these people of colour mix well with the existing force? Why do their opinions change/why do the suggestions of these new officers going to be integrated into the policies?   + Isabella asks a POI talking about internalised racism - bring this back! * We should question how this is going to be implemented! Will it occur meaningfully, or will it occur in a tokenistic fashion? Don’t make it about merit - instead, ask why organic hiring isn’t happening, or can’t happen; then you can say that this may mean we have a less meritocratic approach, which drives an impression that these new officers of colour are underqualified, perpetuating hate and discrimination further. * Don’t say ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’. * Why is the harm here on the other officers? Surely we want to focus on the people of colour, and the impact on them? Who is the more vulnerable actor in the round? * You have to explain why mixing doesn’t change racism that’s been cooked into people’s brains since before they were even born.   Argument 1   * Don’t just observe that police brutality has a number of issues, and Prop has misidentified it - this is the rest of your speech! Lots of repetition from rebuttal here. What does your side do to solve all of these problems? We kind of just say ‘training’ and then move onto the impact. What is the mechanisation of how training works? This is especially important because the other side explains that training hasn’t worked as per status quo. * Explain how the lack of training actually leads to police brutality. * Do you have the fiat to just improve the laws? This isn’t an argument or a benefit - this is just policy/model coming out at 2nd Opp? * This argument comprises of policy = impact, but the analysis as to how this happens is entirely missing! You have to explain the process of change.   05:48 | | | | | | |