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

| **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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  Don’t announce that you didn’t prep a hook, fake it til you make it!  We need a counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.  Good call-out that we presume the vigilantes will behave well.   * We ended the rebuttal too early, you have to tell me WHY you don’t trust them. * Prop already explained why vigilantes are connected to the community so they will behave well, so you have to tell me why this will not be true.   While patrolling doesn’t fix the reason why criminals commit crimes, it does improve the deterrence factor. So you have to weigh why the reason why crimes were committed will still outweigh any consequences they may face from the vigilantes.  On the police having more accountability mechanisms, what are they exactly?   * Tell me how easy it would be to abuse the community systems. Why is it difficult to distinguish the good and bad vigilantes?   On the counter set-up:   * It’s similar to the rebuttal when you point out that it’s easier to reform the police rather than the community. WHAT is your reform? * Good anti-corruption model. * How will you have adequate resources to improve the police? * Don’t admit that you don’t know mid-speech! Confidence at all times!   I am not hearing why the vigilantes will have perverse incentives to abuse their own communities!   * Is there a reason to believe that the communities won’t set up proper systems with some measure of training? * I can understand that there MAY be abuse, but why will this be likely?   + We need to be engaging with Prop’s characterisation that these communities become vigilantes because they actually care about each other.     - Why won’t they hold their own members accountable if they use vigilantism as an excuse to commit more crimes?   On these individuals committing crimes anyways, this is quite similar to your rebuttal.   * It isn’t clear why anything in Opp is also dealing with the root culprit.   + Prop has pointed out that the debate existed in the context where the police have failed, what are you doing differently? * Good impact on more conflict, but we finished too early!   + You can redefine your burden to more harm than good here.   Good job offering POIs today!  6.09 | | | | | | |