| **Student Name:** Ethan Gao |
| --- |

| **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: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  Good job reframing the debate away from the disenfranchised minorities and to the criminals who do deserve mandatory minimums.   * But who exactly are these criminals who MUST be punished under mandatory minimums? * And tell me why the judges won’t use their discretion to punish those people appropriately.   + For instance, explain why mitigating factors used in court sentencing guidelines often rely on just the intention of criminals, which is something they can lie about to get a lower sentence.   Excellent strategy explaining that Opp can co-opt a lot of the benefits:   * On also proposing rehab and other programs, can we still execute those other sentences ON TOP of prolonged incarceration?   + Defend that incarceration ensures that we can give them things like mandatory therapy and counselling. * On including more criminal reforms, do we have these criminal reforms under the status quo? What changes do you propose to criminal law? What are the incentives of the state to do this? * Good job concluding this strategic conclusion.   We need to engage with discrimination more thoroughly!   * Point out that mandatory minimums could also correct the inequality of the privileged getting lower sentences. * Explain that there is a prejudice in sentencing too, so mandatory minimums actively solve it. * Spend time washing out racism in enforcement, however, on a scale, more minorities are victimised under the model of mandatory minimums. So fully engage with the human costs.   On the second clash on preventing crimes, we are not proving the underlying assumption that less sentencing equals less rehabilitation. Why is it the case that longer incarceration means criminals improve?   * The better pushback would have been that a lighter sentence would also hurt the perception of them being rehabilitated! * But it isn’t clear why the judges would actively give very low sentences if these people have committed something severe.   + In reality, they would only get lower sentences if the judges believe the crime was not even that severe to begin with. * On deterrence, it’s not like Prop is letting criminals get away scot free, so we can be more comparative and explain why deterrence was lacking to begin with.   Please offer more POIs!  6.11 | | | | | | |