| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 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.]  Excellent reinforcement that this debate is about unfair punishments to minorities, but so far, your previous speakers did not give any 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.   * Good job recharacterising 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.   While Opp does not solve the root cause, it isn’t clear why the judge’s discretion would also deal with the root problem.   * On the issues of overpolicing and bad policing, Prop does not actually do anything to address the root problem. * There’s nothing in Prop that solves racism either, so just point out that you win on a scale because the police have one less oppressive tool in the toolbox.   + Ultimately, you still win on the human costs because the cyclical harm is less so.   The cyclical harm has already been established by your last two speakers!   * But they 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! * We keep insisting that there will be adequate punishment and accountability, but I am not hearing why we can trust the judges to do so. * Rebut their point on the “lack of criminal motivation” as argued by prop is precisely why the sentence will be reduced to nothing.   What is also the engagement to Opp saying that a lower sentence hurts the perception of rehab so they can no longer be reintegrated into society?  Can we expand a lot more on the claim that deterrence does next to nothing in solving the real culprits of criminal behaviour?  Please offer more POIs!  5.50 - So close to 6!! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |