| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Nice hook focusing on how the policy becomes counterproductive, but explain the explicit link as to how exactly the policy turns these areas into warzones. We don’t want to have an assertion in the hook, otherwise all of the impact is mitigated.   * Good turn of phrases and rhetoric in the hook! * Segue into the set-up sooner, it shouldn’t take more than one minute.   On the counter set-up:   * Good burden clarification that you agree with the problem, but not the method.   + Here we can make an observation that a lot of the harm statements of organised crime from Prop has now become uncontentious. * Clear counterfactual on focusing on rehabilitation.   + An even more strategic tool would be offering tools like plea bargaining to get more information against the criminal overlords to take down the syndicates from within.   + Highlight that a majority of those incarcerated are the pawns, not the powerful.   We’re implying that the people incarcerated are innocent civilians, but it’s not clear why that’s the case!   * Explain that for those who commit crimes due to financial desperation, explain that courts on Opp’s side can mitigate punishment based on differing motivations AND weigh the severity of their offences. So your punishment is more fair and judicious.   + Otherwise, your side is only focusing on the lack of intention without considering the severity of their actions. Some of these people have blood on their hands.   We should’ve pointed out that we can co-opt ALL of Prop’s anti-corruption measures, thus making their entire argument defunct. Anti-corruption laws are  We need to work on speech structure, it isn’t clear which part is the rebuttal and which part is the argument.  The problem with arguing high recidivism rate as a harm is that this is PRECISELY a problem that already plagues organised crime in the status quo anyways.   * Pawns do not get to choose to exit criminal gangs! Their lives are threatened.   + So arguing this harm is completely symmetrical.   It isn’t very clear how rehabilitation would work considering you argued that the underlying motivations behind it are financial.  On pushing crimes underground, that is ALREADY how organised crime works. How can it go even further underground?  Please offer more POIs today!  7.14 | | | | | | |