| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than 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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Good use of rhetoric in the hook, but don’t forget to inject some real grounding as well and not just rely on rhetoric. Why exactly have populist narratives in criminal justice policies failed us here?  On the set-up:   * I appreciate the clarification of the status quo being politicians who have no expertise in criminal justice policies and operate based on popular vote.   + We went a little too much into the kind of characterisation that should be laid out in the arguments instead! Focus on just setting up your world vs theirs in the set-up. * On establishing an agency, explain that this agency is independent/bipartisan.   + On impeaching them, who is impeaching them? Politicians? Then the same harms of politicisation apply.     - Give a clear mechanism that they will be measured based on their performance, i.e. the effectiveness of policies in reducing recidivism. * We need a clear burden or case framing today!   + Weigh for us as to why you believe effectiveness is the most important thing in the debate vs representation.     - E.g. The goal that represents all voters is actually better law and order and less crimes, so the team that fulfills effectiveness is actually doing a better job at fulfilling the public mandate.   On experts being more qualified in making better policies:   * On the politicians are populist in nature, explain the societal stigma against criminals that fuel tough on crime laws are populist, and then explain that it is popular across ALL political parties to advocate for tough on crime laws. So there’s no check and balance.   + Why does the stigma on criminals exist, and why is this difficult to counter. * We need grounding on the failure of tough on crime laws!   + Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice.     - E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanise criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity, rather than view themselves as someone who can reintegrate. * Explain why they do not do fund heavily rehabilitative policies that are actually quite effective   + These are resource-intensive policies which require a high amount of political capital! So this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy. * Good analysis on why politicians actively disregard the views of technocrats on Opp. Give grounding for this! E.g. Trump ignoring Dr Fauci’s recommendation on public health and covid-19 policies because it doesn’t fit the Republican’s pro-autonomy political agenda.   On why technocrats are better off, it’s a very broad analysis on not having to fulfill political incentives.   * Explain that they are evidence-based, rather than sentiment-based. * Provide a mechanistic analysis as well that their positions are decided based off of key performance index.   + Give technocrats specific goals they have to meet, such as reducing recidivism rate, and if they fail, they would be removed from office.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.15 | | | | | | |