| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 6 minutes’ long.]  On calling out Prop’s accusation of politicians being unqualified, correlating this with accusing voters of being unqualified doesn’t quite hit because voters do not need to be qualified, but policymakers ought to be!  The counter set-up should come BEFORE the rebuttals:   * It’s coming out in bits and pieces, it’s only clear later on what the executive appointments are. * While it’s good that you are also incorporating technocrats on Opp, there isn’t a mechanism that ensures that politicians actually listen to them.   + What is the actual case framing on better representation? Why exactly do criminal justice policies need public buy-in order to have any kind of effectiveness?   Good defense that qualifications for public policies do not need to be expertise, but just be democratically representative of what the people want.   * It would be better if we can point out that technocrats also exist on Opp, but why politicians will actively have an incentive to listen to them. * On voters making good decisions, we need to explain why their prejudices against criminals will be outweighed by their understanding of criminal justice policies.   + There is no grounding here. On theory alone, prop is more intuitive for the average voter to prioritise their sentiments against criminals because that is the conventional reality. * In the defense of executive appointments, you are indirectly also defending Prop’s process of forming an independent body of technocrats doing this.   While I appreciate the defense of democratic choices, it is not clear why any of this engages with Prop’s point on the EFFECTIVENESS of criminal justice policies:   * Why do they still pass tough on crime laws despite its ineffectiveness? * In what way do tough on crime laws actually do anything positive in the realm of criminal justice? * We need to address the voter prejudices that Prop argued.   + Why will voters be objective and value effectiveness over their prejudices?   We’re entering the arguments too late at the 5th minute! Do not voice out your inner monologue on your own failures.  Good challenge to the impeachment system being incredibly flawed.  We need to spend way more time on democratic representation:   * While politicians may care about effectiveness, it’s unclear why this outweighs their incentive to be popularly elected based on populist sentiments.   + How do you ensure that public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies? * It’s unclear on what is the grounding of criminal justices policies that are only correct in data but not correct when applied to reality?   + Without the illustrations, it’s unclear how this statement is true or what the harms of this actually are.     - Why do criminal justice policies only work when there is public buy-in?   Good job offering POIs today!  7.27 | | | | | | |