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

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Try not to borrow too many phrases from Bo Seo, it’s obvious!  Good call out that Prop doesn’t have the fiat for more resources, but try to engage with Prop stating that the funding that would have otherwise gone to the police would be going towards welfare.   * Point out that Prop then cannot claim the benefits of using the police as the check and balance to misbehaving vigilantes!   + How can Prop fix the police if they actively supported defunding them?   Good rebuttal on creating more conflict, but this is reliant on the recharacterisation of the incentives of the vigilantes.   * Prop says they wanted less crimes and more peace, why will they be courting danger to their own community? * I am not hearing why the vigilantes will have perverse incentives to behave like other criminals! 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 communities not trusting the vigilantes who are abusive, isn’t this precisely the reason as to why vigilantes will behave properly? If they don’t act in the interest of the community, then it contradicts the very reason why they became a vigilante and they may lose their power.  Strong characterization of the state of poverty, but why is this something that only Opp can address?   * They’ve called out the fact that Opp has no fiat to solve poverty as well.   + Prop has also pointed out that the debate existed in the context where the police have failed, what is Opp doing differently to deal with the suboptimal choices they have in the status quo? * While vigilantism 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.   Good job offering POIs today!  6.18 | | | | | | |