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

| **Motion:** This house will ban plea bargaining |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  Excellent hook focusing on the human costs in an illustrative way, but link it back to the motion of plea bargaining! Otherwise, it’s unclear how this harm is related to plea bargaining.  On the set-up, we went deep into the characterisation on the flaws of the justice system but it’s not clear why any of this belongs here instead of the arguments!   * The model is too simple!   + What are alternative mechanisms you will utilise in order for the police to gain more information?     - How will you deal with the backlog of cases in the justice system when every accused criminal contests their charge? * Good stance!   Strong argument on proportionality.   * Don’t dive straight into weighing, establish first the premise that every instance of plea bargaining is a form of injustice, and destroy the proportionality of punishment. * The actual weighing did not weigh! We simply stated that victims deserve redress, but why is this more important than providing justice to other victims to the justice system? * Good initial impact on turning the public against the justice system. But what is the HARM of losing public trust?   + Expand it to the silencing of victims and a cycle of crime.   + We can also argue for less cooperation by the public. * While this does benefit the criminals in a vacuum, we are ignoring the ways in which a plea bargain benefits the system.   + How can you mitigate these benefits or offer alternative pathways of achieving it?   + How does this compare to Opp’s argument on optimising limited resources in order to protect other victims of the justice system?   Good second claim on the abuse of plea bargaining.   * We need to spend time explaining why it’s so difficult to implement checks and balances within this process.   + Why do we even allow the prosecutors to lie and coerce in this process? Can’t we just regulate against this? * Good reasoning on the perverse incentive of prosecutors to increase their success rate of prosecution! * Tell me why minorities fall into this trap even when they’re innocent.   + Explain other ways in which racism limits the choices available to the accused. * On innocent convictions, we need to explain the moral impact of this rather than just asserting the impact.   Don’t voice out your internal monologue, just push through!  8.24 | | | | | | |