| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 job shifting the debate into the types of crimes that DO require mandatory minimums!   * However, Prop has argued that this debate is not about severe crimes, because judges can still deliver harsh punishments in those scenarios.   + So you have to critically expand as to why judges won’t be able to make the correct decisions without mandatory minimums.     - Point out that this is often a byproduct of massive racial and gender privilege on top of wealth privilege. Then link it back to how mandatory minimums innately corrects the problem.   We cannot only have tunnel vision on our best case scenarios, what about Prop’s situations where the poor and the ethnic minorities are the predominant victims of mandatory minimum policies.  On the criticism of judges, we need to be engaging with ALL of the reasoning that came from the speaker before you:   * She argued the moral compass of judges, public pressure, and the severe harms of crimes that cannot be denied.   The better strategy would have been to explain that Opp can co-opt a lot of the benefits:   * Propose rehab and other programs to deal with prop’s crimes of necessity.   + Defend that incarceration ensures that we can give them things like mandatory therapy and counselling. * Point out that a lot of Prop’s problems are related to poorly formed mandatory minimum policies, rather than an inherent objection to the concept of mandatory minimum.   On judges being intimidated, it isn’t clear why we have to debate incredibly flawed and corrupt judicial systems where the independence of the judiciary is not well-established.   * However, nothing on Opp is fixing the problem of incompetent judges. Ultimately, your model also relies on judges making all of the decisions.   All of the impacts are contingent on the above analysis of poor judging which has not been well-established yet!   * In theory, the social devolution of poor law enforcement is well-done! It’s just based on a premise that is unproven.   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.   Please offer more POIs!  6.15 | | | | | | |