| **Student Name:** Zechariah Chen |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 focal point on the human costs of organised criminal syndicates with some good phrasings thrown in there, well done!  On the set-up:   * Tough on crime being the only way to contain the problem is actually a high burden, you can lower the burden to prove necessity or that it’s justified. * Good burden pushing to Opp on proving the failure of status quo with soft policies. * Anti-corruption laws are definitely NOT tough on crime enough, and can be co-opted by the Opposition easily. * Give a comparison to showcase how different is the level of enforcement, prosecution and punishment between Prop’s model and the status quo.   + For example, we will allow the police to wiretap without a court warrant, or we offer prolonged incarceration even for the pawns.   The first argument can’t last for just 30 seconds!  We have to expand the reasons why organised crime is so prevalent, then characterise precisely how tough on crime laws will be effective in addressing these.   * For example, tough on crime laws will impose a penalty on bystanders, so people who witness no longer stay silent as they fear incarceration more than they fear the intimidation of these criminal groups.   Some of the problems you’re identifying are not solved by your policy! If law enforcement officers are underpaid, then tough on crime laws do nothing to address the underlying problem and financial incentives.  On the state providing more to their officers, it isn’t clear why Opp cannot just co-opt all of this.   * All of the mechanisations are incredibly similar to one another, it’s hard to find its distinct value.   The explanation on why organised crimes are severely harmful are not contentious in this debate!   * Opp will likely agree with all of these harms, but just disagree on whether the tough on crime laws will actively work. * There is still room to make this contentious if we turn it into a principled legal argument on when is it justified to impose a disproportionately high punishment, and thus proving that those criminals DESERVE it (irrespective of effectiveness).   Good job offering POIs today!  7.03 | | | | | | |