| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Nice focal point on the human costs exacted by organised criminal syndicates with a good amount of descriptives!   * On still being held responsible for the crimes, burden push the Opposition to actively defend forgiving the criminals based on the principle justification they gave.   Good pushback on the lack of accountability on the Opposition's side.   * I appreciate the moral reframing to the real victims in this equation. * Investigate a lot more on what exactly does the Opposition support. If Opp is still punishing them anyways, then they’re contradicting all of their own arguments about the criminals being the real victims in the debate.   We need you to set up the comparative more effectively on actively tackling the problem of organised crime.   * 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.   + 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. * All of the above would’ve been a good response to the POI given by Jasmine! Engage with her countermodel of rehabilitation and tell me why it won’t work specifically in the case of organised crime.   Reinforce your previous speaker, the focal point on having more time is very important! 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.  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?   Strong rhetoric on these criminals deserve it, but it overlaps greatly with all of your rebuttals.   * Interesting claim about signalling that these criminals will get away with the crime, but Opp argues that there is deterrence on their side. So we need to re-characterise first why Opp has to defend a policy with zero deterrence. * On state cooperation, we have to contrast this with jasmine’s argument on the community empathising with the poor criminals who are coerced into this lifestyle and now stuck behind bars forever.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.02 | | | | | | |