| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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; we need to characterise more stringently how a miscarriage of justice is taking place - that the poor are being disproportionately incarcerated. Let’s try to curate our problem with more attention to phrasing.  Set-up   * Why and how will they ensure this?   + Fair on caseload limits; but then doesn’t this mean that the waiting time for others goes up by a grave amount? Don’t say ‘before the Opp attacks us’ - just explain how you recognise that the status quo isn’t great. The actual explanation of the fix is too vague though!     - Why will more of the budget be allocated here? Explain why political capital and will did not exist prior, but does now. You can’t just rely on fiat to do this.   + Good on the metric of severity - good illustration of the different cases.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument, beyond ‘unfairness’. * Good work integrating the example of Weinstein; explain what the difference between private and public defenders are. Start by setting up the problem; explain how this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - and the kind of practices they employ as a consequence; we should talk about plea bargaining, about out of court settlements and so forth. We eventually do this, but should really iron out the structure of the argument to clearly build up to a specific outcome + impact; for instance - the first thing I’m going to establish is how the systematic overworking of public defenders means they lose more cases… * We should then contrast this by characterising private lawyers:   + They 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. * Out of court settlements still exist in your world! You don’t get rid of these. * The point should be that voters don’t care because most of them don’t commit crime/lots can afford it - this is the average voter, not the average person to be clear. We need to incentivise these people to care about the system - and the way to do it is by increasing their personal stake in the situation. * What’s the harm here - if the system is broken! Explain who gets free and gets away, and what harms [to] the public this creates. Does it reduce trust in the system? Do they feel alienated and let down by the state? The impact of this argument isn’t being explained!   We can also run a principle on 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.  05:04 - Let’s make sure to ask POIs consistently! Is your POI to Tiffany a question? | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 call out - good work following through with this! Your opening highlights well the central issue on their side - that the current system is already overloaded - they make it worse. Don’t say that’s why they lose, but that they make the system WORSE - and hence, can’t win.  Set-up needs to come before rebuttal so that the comparative can be clear. It’s logically prior to rebuttal!  Rebuttal   * We need to immediately resolve what happens to the poor; analysis on the quality of public defenders is well and good, but not the clincher. * POI - do they get rid of out of court settlements? Don’t they incentivise this further because the case load never ends.   Set-up   * We needed to explain that we will let people use private defenders, but pump funding into public defense/make private lawyers more accessible to the poor; through subsidies, or even policies. Does our set-up engage with the harm accruing to the poor on Prop at all?   + 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. * Spectating? Fair on restrictions. Good work on how there are other mechanisms to fix the wealth gap.   Argument 1   * POI - point that they don’t have the fiat to just increase funding for public defenders - they need to explain how this happens. Call them out for the lack of mechanisation! * Good on quality - they don’t dispute this though; they agree private lawyers are better. The point to make is that now everyone has a bad lawyer who is overworked and underfunded - things go worse for everyone!   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. Ask if this will ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; or will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?  We shouldn’t take two POIs in a five minute speech - one is more than enough!  05:04 | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 - highlight how you equalise the playing field, they entrench the wealth gap further. Try to address their model, in terms of whether they can realistically make private defense attorneys more accessible to the average person?  Rebuttal   * Say yes! They are better, because they have money and time - that’s the issue, which is that only those who can afford them access their services - and hence can win. We want to make sure that everyone uses public defenders, because this is the mechanism to fix it.   + The point is that funding to these departments isn’t a voting issue because it doesn’t impact the average voter. They are ignored because the wealthy don’t use them! The poor aren’t a pertinent voting demographic, hence, politicians don’t pander to them. 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.   + This responds to Tiffany’s POI - people care and vote on education, hence meaning public school is given resources and funded. This doesn’t apply to public defenders.   Argument 1   * Explain how this is a system which is overburdened and overworked - and the kind of practices they employ as a consequence; we should talk about plea bargaining, about out of court settlements and so forth. We should really iron out the structure of the argument to clearly build up to a specific outcome + impact; for instance - the first thing I’m going to establish is how the systematic overworking of public defenders means they lose more cases… * We should then contrast this by characterising private lawyers:   + They 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. * On the same lawyer to all - explain why this version of justice is fair and legitimate. * What’s the harm here - if the system is broken! Explain who gets free and gets away, and what harms [to] the public this creates. Does it reduce trust in the system? Do they feel alienated and let down by the state? The impact isn’t being explained! * Good work pointing out how the quality of the lawyer will impact the jury’s decision. * Good on how pay is tied to incentive to be in this field.   We still haven’t been able to explain how public defenders aren’t overworked and burdened in our world.  We need to ask POIs consistently!  05:12 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tiffany Chan |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 openings need to be more curated and carefully phrased; what does it mean that they’re making society worse? Be specific! We need to explain how the solution isn’t to deprive the average person of a private lawyer; it’s to increase the quality of public defense, and make the existing system stronger against the wealthy.  Good work calling out the problem in the status quo - explain why this is true, and why this perpetuates in their world. They don’t have the fiat to just increase funding for public defenders - they need to explain how this happens.  Good response to the POI.  We’re missing the comparative - why doesn’t this problem exist in your world?   * We needed to explain that we will let people use private defenders, but pump funding into public defense/make private lawyers more accessible to the poor; through subsidies, or even policies.   + If First Opp doesn’t do this, you need to fill this gap - does our set-up engage with the harm accruing to the poor on Prop at all? * 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   * Good work identifying the principled harm here - first, explain how or 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.   + Good analogy to public/private schools and hospitals. The purpose of public services is EQUITY, not equality. * Ask if this will ensure the best possible defense, and hence the best possible decision; or will it lead to a miscarriage of justice?   Good POIs to Sophia! Ideally, ask them when you aren’t the person speaking immediately after.  04:40 - why are we speaking under-time? | | | | | | |