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

| **Motion:** This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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.]  The call-out can be more effective by explaining how the flaw actively kills off their case, instead it sounds like you’re giving them a constructive suggestion on how to make their case better.  We should actively defend what are the necessary qualifications for public policy makers. They do not need to be expertise, but just be democratically representative of what the people want.   * It would be better if we can point out that technocrats also exist on Opp, but why politicians will actively have an incentive to listen to them.   Please rebut their impeachment system because this model contradicts all of their arguments!  Can we defend why voters make good decisions? We need to explain why their prejudices against criminals will be outweighed by their understanding of criminal justice policies.  Good job reinforcing the role of the public in creating policies that help with reintegration of criminals into society.   * Now we just need a comparative of why reintegration is the MOST important thing when coming up with criminal justice policies.   + We need to engage with the perverse political incentives to implement the kind of tough-on-crime laws that worsens crime rates.   + The last speaker explained why politicians are likely to engage in blame games and not implement evidence-based policies that actively fix the problem.   While I appreciate the defense of public sentiment, it is not clear why any of this engages with Prop’s point on the EFFECTIVENESS of criminal justice policies:   * Why do they still pass tough on crime laws despite its ineffectiveness? * In what way do tough on crime laws actually do anything positive in the realm of criminal justice? * We need to address the voter prejudices that Prop argued.   + Why will voters be objective and value effectiveness over their prejudices?   We need to spend way more time on democratic representation:   * While politicians may care about effectiveness, it’s unclear why this outweighs their incentive to be popularly elected based on populist sentiments.   + How do you ensure that public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies? * It’s unclear on what is the grounding of criminal justices policies that are only correct in data but not correct when applied to reality?   + Without the illustrations, it’s unclear how this statement is true or what the harms of this actually are.   On the argument that experts do not care:   * Politicians also prop up discrimination if that is the popular sentiment, so how do we know what kind of society this is? One that entrenches racism or fights racism? * We need to establish first what is the relationship between criminal justice policies and racism. What role does the former play in fighting injustice?   + Give some grounding and examples of an evidence-based policy which may unintentionally entrench racism. Why would a technocrat end up supporting things like redlining?   Please offer more POIs today!  6.15 | | | | | | |