| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice call-out in the beginning that technocrats are detached in reality, but it’s quite assertive without any real examples. 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.   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?   On democratic representation:   * Bear in mind that this is the exact same argument as your first speaker! * 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? * What is the implication of passing policies that no longer reflect the democratic will? Is this harmful?   + Why do criminal justice policies only work when there is public buy-in?   + Explain that societal reintegration can only happen if the public believes that criminals are adequately punished. So they will continue to ostracise these criminals even after they have completed their sentence. * On the loss of trust, we stopped at just saying this will happen! But what is the harm of not trusting the justice system?   + The next point on low buy-in is the actual harm of the previous point. What actions will they take? Where do we need buy-in in order to deliver the goals of the system?   + There’s only vague theory on needing their help, but it’s not clear what these look like in practice!   Please offer more POIs today!  7.32 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |