| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice start incorporating a little bit of rhetoric as well as content.  On the set-up:   * Instead of diving right into the example of 3 strikes law, explain first the concept of mandatory minimum.   + We are broadly explaining that judges will have to disregard circumstances of the offender or the crime, but that’s not entirely true because mitigating factors can still exist in sentencing guidelines. It’s just that it cannot go beyond the mandatory minimum.   + We went deep into argumentative characterisation here, take it out and put the contextual analysis in the arguments instead. * Good counterfactual but be even more clear that you will give judges the full discretion and it will be decided on a case-by-case basis.   We’re going into our arguments very late at 3:00. Aim to move on by 2:00 to 2:30.  We cannot spend only 15-20 seconds on one layer of analysis! It consisted of just the assertion that minorities are trapped in a cycle of crime.   * There’s an unproven assertion that mandatory minimum means that everyone will be treated the same. There’s still a scale of sentencing and judge’s discretion.   Why do you think that these convictions all target minorities? We’re lacking 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.  We are also asserting that the punishment is too harsh and the criminals don’t deserve it.   * Why don’t they? Contextualise the crime for me and who these criminals are.   + E.g. Selling drugs is a matter of survival in these communities.   + E.g. Low-income offenders are recruited into organised criminal syndicates and they are not allowed to opt out for fear of their own lives.   + Absent of the reasons why some of these criminals are actually victims, conventional wisdom dictates that someone who commits a harsh crime deserves the punishment.   Good impacting analysis on what happens to these people who are trapped in a cycle when they suffer harsh punishments, but this is an abstract argument against punishing anyone harshly. By this logic, you want low sentences for everyone. Nuance it to the right context.  Try to avoid taking the POI as soon as it’s asked, to showcase better control of your speech flow.  Please offer more POIs!  6.09 | | | | | | |