| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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: | 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: This is a 4 minutes’ reply speech.]  Have a hook, Shi Qi! Instead of diving right into the meat of things.  Good reinforcement that discretionary sentencing is something that Opp will still have to defend!   * Take this further and explain that if their problem is biased judges, then they do nothing to fix it. * Take this moment to also explain that Prop’s burden is not to solve racism to begin with.   + I understand that racism would be more entrenched under overpolicing, etc, but still 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.   On rehabilitation, instead of just saying it’s not exclusive to Opp, say it IS exclusive to Prop.   * Good job pointing out that rehab is terrible in prisons. But why?   + Can we link it back to the main goal of reducing crime rates?     - Then you can use this response to take down their point of deterrence.   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.   Good job explaining that Prop wins proportionality because these minorities do not deserve it   * 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.   Good job offering POIs today!  4.30 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |