| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  We spent a lot of time summarising Prop’s point and took too long making the call-out, be succinct and prove your assertion that the status quo was even enough in dealing with the prevalent problem of organised crime.   * Here, we could’ve made a clear burden that clarification that you agree with the problem, but not the method.   + Then we can make an observation that a lot of the harm statements of organised crime from Prop has now become uncontentious.   On the counter set-up:   * Clear counterfactual on focusing on rehabilitation.   + An even more strategic tool would be offering tools like plea bargaining to get more information against the criminal overlords to take down the syndicates from within.   + Highlight that a majority of those incarcerated are the pawns, not the powerful.   On deterrence already existing in the status quo, you have to provide grounding on what the punishment for these crimes are presently.   * After explaining all of the reasons as to why someone joins organised crime, how is anything that Opp offers deals with those core motivations?   + How does your rehabilitation model deal with the financial motivations as to why people join gangs?   We’re losing a lot of our speech flow today! Don’t monologue your inner thoughts!  We should also be rebutting her core analysis on why giving the prosecution more powers would buy them time and tools to crack down on organised crime better.  A lot of the analysis on why deterrence doesn’t actually work overlaps with the rebuttals.   * The analysis that they turn to a life of crime post-incarceration is problematic:   + One, because you told me you also already have highly deterrent punishments, so you are also incarcerating them.   + Two, the problem with arguing high recidivism rate as a harm is that this is PRECISELY a problem that already plagues organised crime in the status quo anyways. * Pawns do not get to choose to exit criminal gangs! Their lives are threatened.   + So arguing this harm is completely symmetrical.   On the people incarcerated are mostly pawns, is that necessarily different for how Opp deals with them?   * Explain that for those who commit crimes due to financial desperation, explain that courts on Opp’s side can mitigate punishment based on differing motivations AND weigh the severity of their offences. So your punishment is more fair and judicious.   + Otherwise, your side is only focusing on the lack of intention without considering the severity of their actions. Some of these people have blood on their hands. * On more cooperation, it isn’t clear as to why there are incentives for them to do this. Won’t the syndicate have more sway over them still?   + Introduce legal policies like plea bargaining where we lower their sentence or give them immunity altogether if they offered us information. This will be more effective in cracking down on the groups while simultaneously protecting the pawns of the operations.   Please offer more POIs today!  7.15 | | | | | | |