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

| **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: | 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.]  Nice start but perhaps you want to be clear that you are describing the three-strikes law in California, otherwise it sounds unbelievable that this is a thing that happens.  On the set-up:   * Good counterfactual on giving judges the full discretion and it will be decided on a case-by-case basis. * Well done on the clear precedence and guidelines for the public.   + We should also explain what mandatory minimums are! Point out that judges will have to disregard circumstances of the offender or the crime, or the motivations of the criminal! * The burden of societal good is too broad, try to be more specific with your winning pathway.   On the argument of being principally correct:   * We are asserting that the punishment is too harsh and the criminals don’t deserve it. It isn’t clear to me why mandatory minimum laws are always very poorly formulated and focus on excessive punishment for low-stakes crimes. What about having mandatory minimums for high-stakes crimes? * Why don’t they? Contextualise the crime for me and who these criminals are.   + E.g. Selling drugs is a matter of survival in these communities.   + E.g. Low-income offenders are recruited into organised criminal syndicates and they are not allowed to opt out for fear of their own lives.   + Absent of the reasons why some of these criminals are actually victims, conventional wisdom dictates that someone who commits a harsh crime deserves the punishment. * The other moral angle of this is that a lot of these convictions target minorities. Zero-tolerance policies which are a common mandatory minimum law 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.   + Here, we can explain trapping these minorities into a cycle of crime.   Don’t voice out your inner monologue when the opponents didn’t offer you a POI!  On prison overcrowding:   * We need to work on improving the link as to why mandatory minimums is the culprit behind mass incarceration! * Shouldn’t the answer be criminal reforms, or better funding of prisons? * We need a comparative analysis here! What alternative measures are you supporting to improve rehabilitation in prisons?   Please offer more POIs!  5.58 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |