| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Good call-outs but we’re still NOT QUITE proving it. Execute this fully by demonstrating how you solve all of the deadlocks.  Rather than utilising this speech structure, we need to restructure everything to a team-by-team comparison from the start!   * We would be better off reinforcing your extension from the start, because your member only spent one minute on it.   While I appreciate the defense of democratic choices, it is not clear why any of this engages with Prop’s point on the EFFECTIVENESS of criminal justice policies:   * Why do they still pass tough on crime laws despite its ineffectiveness? * In what way do tough on crime laws actually do anything positive in the realm of criminal justice? * We need to address the voter prejudices that Prop argued.   + Why will voters be objective and value effectiveness over their prejudices?   Bear in mind that since your opening argued democratic choices, that you should then differentiate how any of your rebuttals are unique to your team, and not derivative of your opening.  Good defense that CO has a better democratic system, and we can hold politicians accountable for making bad decisions.   * But this only exists in theory, what is the grounding for when this accountability mechanism is effective? * We should actively defend what are the necessary qualifications for public policy makers. They do not need to be expertise, but just be democratically representative of what the people want. * It would be better if we can point out that technocrats also exist on Opp, but why politicians will actively have an incentive to listen to them.   While politicians may care about effectiveness, it’s unclear why this outweighs their incentive to be popularly elected based on populist sentiments.   * How do you ensure that public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies? * It’s unclear on what is the grounding of criminal justices policies that are only correct in data but not correct when applied to reality? Without the illustrations, it’s unclear how this statement is true or what the harms of this actually are.   What is the actual case framing on better representation? Why exactly do criminal justice policies need public buy-in order to have any kind of effectiveness?  Excellent job reinforcing biased data being the baseline for these terrible policies.   * But what is the grounding of terrible criminal justice policies that become the byproduct of bad data? What is the biased data?   Good defense that qualifications for public policies do not need to be expertise, but just be democratically representative of what the people want.   * It would be better if we can point out that technocrats also exist on Opp, but why politicians will actively have an incentive to listen to them. * On voters making good decisions, we need to explain why their prejudices against criminals will be outweighed by their understanding of criminal justice policies.   + There is no grounding here. On theory alone, prop is more intuitive for the average voter to prioritise their sentiments against criminals because that is the conventional reality.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.35 - We’re a little short on time! | | | | | | |