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

| **Motion:** This house supports vigilantism in high-crime areas |
| --- |

| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Interesting hook that George Floyd would be alive in a world of vigilantes, but bear in mind that nothing in your world rids us of bad cops. So those people could still hurt others on both sides.  Good job reinforcing the checks-and-balances in the vigilante system.   * Why are you relying on the police as your main corrective mechanism when your problem statement is that the police are weak and inefficient? * Expand even more the idea of vigilantes holding one another accountable!   + It’s not just the loss of legitimacy. Vigilantes do this because they care about rights and justice, so they won’t allow their fellow members to abuse the law.   On criticising their countermodel, tell me why anti-corruption is inadequate in solving crime rates.   * Explain that this wouldn’t fix the trust deficit, and only community enforcement will work. * Explain that this wouldn’t increase finite resources, and only community vigilantes can close the human resource gap because all of us could patrol for crimes.   On the community being in charge of vigilantism, nice characterisation on them being proximate to everyone and connected.   * We can expand this to explain why they will create a good structure overall to ensure safety, such as training their members on how to deal with high-conflict circumstances.   + This deals with Opp’s impact on the vigilantes creating more conflict in society! * We need to impact the point of safety and focus on the human costs!   + Point out that the right to security must be delegated to private actors if the state fails to protect their human rights.   + We referenced the right to protect ourselves, but we didn’t connect this right as the extension of the right to life   Interesting point on reducing the need for tough on crime laws, but we need to explain first why tough on crime laws were even bad to begin with and they happen in response to high crime rates.  Good job offering POIs today!  6.18 | | | | | | |