| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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.]  Nice focal point on the human costs exacted by organised criminal syndicates! We can be even more descriptive for this to have a visceral effect on the judge.   * On not waiting for the harms to happen, it would be even better if you specify the ways or extent in which the status quo has failed.   On the set-up:   * Good clarity on increasing punishment with each crime, enforcement and powers to crack down on organised crime, as well as zero-tolerance policies. We can expand a little bit more on what zero-tolerance policies even mean. * Spend some time burden pushing to Opp on proving the failure of the status quo with soft policies.   + Illustrate even more all of the comparisons between Prop and Opp policies.     - For example, we will allow the police to wiretap without a court warrant, but the Opp has to jump through hoops to gain approval in which time the organised crime can get away with the crime.   Good claim on swift justice!   * First spend time precisely what mechanisms exist on Prop that helps you save time, before talking about delays.   + We mentioned bureaucratic delays, explain the failures of the status quo when it comes to expedient prosecution. Why is taking so much time and how does your policy address it? * Explain why time is of the essence when it comes to catching them, e.g. they have a wide network to relocate their base of operations quickly and they have insiders giving them information, so we have to act fast to catch them before they follow through with their getaway plan. * We made a logical leap about getting rid of the entire group, it’s unclear how you do this.   + Even if some people are incarcerated for a long time, they will still have other members who can continue their operations. Are you suggesting that you can capture every single one of them?   We need even more specific mechanistic analysis on how tough on crime laws will be effective in addressing the problem.   * For example, tough on crime laws will impose a penalty on bystanders, so people who witness no longer stay silent as they fear incarceration more than they fear the intimidation of these criminal groups.   I appreciate the initial response that they are still responsible for committing crimes even if they joined gangs out of desperation.   * Go even further and burden push the Opposition to forgive them ALL.   + Then contrast the moral costs to the REAL victims who died at the hands of organised crime.   On greater deterrent effect, we’re analysing in generic terms, rather than nuanced to the reasons why they commit these crimes to begin with.   * If deterrence alone was enough, then why did they commit the crimes to begin with? Was the punishment in the status quo not enough? What is even the current punishment? * Explain that they would initially fear reporting an organised criminal member, but if these people are incarcerated for a long time, then they would feel much safer post-reporting.   Any long-term benefits to society when you solve the issue of organised crime would be contingent on you proving the effectiveness of your model first!  Good job offering POIs today!  7.08 | | | | | | |