| **Student Name:** Jasmine 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.]  Maybe don’t reference that you are stealing Gaby Lin’s opening line!  Good defense of judges, but actively explain the proper training they are required to complete rather than just rely on their moral compass.   * We should strategically point out that Opp does nothing to actually fix biases, so they also have to defend discretionary sentencing and all the harms are symmetrical. * On the public pressure to judges, this could also be used against you if the public is prejudiced. The better source of external pressure is academic scrutiny from the legal experts and the legal fraternity.   Don’t get sucked into what counts as felonies!   * You can instead shift the debate into all other mandatory minimum policies that Opp still has to defend other than the three strikes law.   + We need to provide more clarity for the judges on where does the debate happen, after you mentioned things like this debate is never about crimes of murder.   Good call out that Opp has limited fiat, but we have to impact this.   * Which parts of their model are now defunct as a result of limited opp fiat? * Nice job co-opting a lot of their countermodel.   + On rehabilitation, instead of just saying it’s not exclusive to Opp, say it IS exclusive to Prop. i.e. point out that rehab is terrible in prisons. Can we link it back to the main goal of reducing crime rates?     - Then you can use this response to take down their point of deterrence.   Nice rebuttal that deterrence doesn’t particularly apply for crimes of passion nor crimes of necessity.  The argument has an overlap with some of the pre-existing rebuttal above!   * Don’t just get stuck with a singular example of low-income criminals, compound the contextualisation of all of the criminals who don’t deserve mandatory minimums.   + 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. * 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.   The conclusion to the argument could also be that Prop wins proportionality and justice because these minorities/poor people do not deserve such harsh punishment.   * Try to frame it back to the role of the criminal justice system.   We need to actively engage with Opp’s point on specific types of crimes that DO deserve mandatory minimums such as prevalent social ills of drug use.  Please offer more POIs!  6.15 | | | | | | |