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

| **Motion:** This house will abolish mandatory minimum sentencing |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 reframing that this debate is not about solving racism, but mandatory minimums make it far worse.   * Why do you think that these convictions all target minorities? We’re lacking contextual analysis on why these crimes are often only selectively enforced against the lower class while the privileged get away with the crime, e.g. explain the racism in the enforcement of laws pertaining to drug offences which all have mandatory minimum laws.   In response to the POI, well done finally characterising why minorities are often the victims and targets of mandatory minimums.   * Don’t stop at just drug offenses, explain why low-income offenders are recruited into organised criminal syndicates and they are not allowed to opt out for fear of their own lives.   Excellent characterisation of the kind of crimes under mandatory minimums receive far more attention by the police, while white-collar crimes get away with it.   * However, abolishing mandatory minimums does not necessarily change the incentives of the police force. * So a lot of the harm of the false sense of security is symmetrical.   On the issues of overpolicing and bad policing, again Prop does not actually do anything to address the root problem, but you simply take out one tool from the toolbox.  The cyclical harm has already been established by your first speaker!   * But she didn’t explain why judges are likely to give far lower sentences on your side, so we should focus on the mechanistic analysis instead.   We need to actively engage with Opp’s point on judges being biased and mandatory minimums are a way to keep them in check.   * If they can accuse you of not fixing the police, then you can accuse them of not fixing the courts!   Good job offering POIs today!  6.30 - Watch for time | | | | | | |