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

| **Motion:** This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Good use of rhetoric in the hook, but don’t forget to inject some real grounding as well and not just rely on rhetoric. Why exactly have politicians failed us here?  On the set-up:   * Are criminal justice policies predominantly just on criminal punishment? That was implied in the first few parts of the model. * Why exactly are you listening to public opinion in your model? Your case will be on why public opinion is terrible.   + When you have gauged public opinion, how much influence will you be putting on this? If none, then why did we bother doing this? * We need a clear burden or case framing today!   On voter prejudices:   * Explain precisely why the stigma on criminals exists, and how that leads to tough on crime laws. * Rather than state that politicians are just not experts, explain the precise perverse incentive that tough on crime laws are populist and lead to easy votes. * Good job pointing out that tough on crime laws often lead to high rates of recidivism!   + But try not to just analyse this generically. Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice.     - E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanise criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity, rather than view t * On the potential policies such as funding drug rehab programs, we have to explain precisely why politicians will not do it instead of just repeating the stigma point.   + These are resource-intensive policies which require a high amount of political capital! So this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.   On why technocrats are better off, it’s a very broad analysis on data and research-oriented.   * Provide a mechanistic analysis as well that their positions are decided based off of key performance index.   + Give technocrats specific goals they have to meet, such as reducing recidivism rate, and if they fail, they would be removed from office.   Where is your second argument?  Don’t give up halfway through your conclusion!!  Good job offering POIs today!  7.19 | | | | | | |