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

| **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.]  The counter set-up needs to come BEFORE the rebuttals! Clarify your position first.   * It isn’t clear why strengthening communities and democracies are part of a MODEL. What steps are you actually taking here? * Why is rooting out corruption something that is exclusive to Opp? It also isn’t clear why we’re saying this considering that Prop never argued corruption as part of the problem. * Good job incorporating technocrats on Opp! But there isn’t a mechanism that ensures that politicians actually listen to them.   + Good initial framing on better representation, but the framing does not answer why representation IS the winning pathway. Why exactly do criminal justice policies need public buy-in order to have any kind of effectiveness?   We need to actively criticise their model to answer whether or not technocrats will fail!   * Point out that Prop attempted to cross the aisle by implementing a model that listens to public opinion.   + Explain that they contradicted all of their own benefits because they criticised public opinion, and yet proposed to still listen to the public!   When we mentioned that politicians do consider effectiveness, we cannot just assert this.   * Why do they still pass tough on crime laws despite its ineffectiveness then? * We need to address the voter prejudices that Prop argued. * Good job pointing out that technocrats also exist on Opp, but can you explain why politicians will actually listen to them?   We’re entering the arguments too late at the 5th minute!!  If the courts are politicised, then your politicians are even MORE politicised because that is the nature of their work!   * The essence of your argument is that politicisation is BAD, but that is INHERENTLY what your own world relies on. So this argument sounds like you are criticising yourself! * At best, this is a mitigatory rebuttal.   Democratic representation should have been the essence of your case!   * Again, the analysis is very defensive and there’s no positive defense of your actual case. You have to analyse:   + Why public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies,   + Why criminal justice can only work when it reflects public sentiments,   + The harms of criminal justice policies that are undemocratic.   Please offer more POIs today!  7.19 | | | | | | |