| **Student Name:** Amanda |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the Scandinavian prison model. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:**  Speaking time: 06:21.4, good work!   * Good assertiveness and tone usage in the hook. Good content as well! Maintain your composure though. * Good signposting! * Try to be more specific with what are the rights you will grant the prisoner; this is tedious, but it is necessary to prevent your opponents from pushing unstrategic burdens onto you. * Try to be a bit less choppy in your sentence construction and presentation during the definition; it has to look less like you are thinking on the spot! * Good work attempting to provide multiple points while defining the Scandinavian model. * Make sure to start your argumentation with a claim first, e.g., that this will help rehabilitate people better, etc. * Good response to the POI; make sure to prove that the government would actually have the money to pay for these facilities. * You gotta tell us about why the success rate is going to be high; there are specific things that need to be said here. Try to first analyse why these prisoners will become worse and or better with around 3-4 things, then move into explaining the solutions. * The speech feels quite defensive; pre-empting is a good thing, but it shouldn't be the main point of your speech. Also, statistics only illustrate as compared to proving an argument! * Time management is a **major** issue in this speech; you only entered your arguments at 4:04!!! * The argument about the drug user vs the murder doesn’t quite take into account that a lot of prisons already separate criminals by severity of crime (Low/Mid/Max security) and the Scandinavian model does not quite change this. * Try to make sure to tell me why gangs will exist in a non-scandivian model prison; is it because these prisons are terrible and you need to join a gang to have a sense of safety? * Hand gestures could be improved further. * The point about wanting the criminals to not lose the feeling of being a part of society was well done, however, try explaining why community engagement is beneficial in rehabilitating a person. * Try utilizing broader terminologies such as rehabilitation, retribution, punishment, deterrence, etc. * It is unclear how Scandinavian prisons will not have gangs that may be harmful to prisoners. |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Alvina |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the Scandinavian prison model. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * The start of your speech talked about financial limitations that prevent from being able to build good prison cells for 1.8 million prisoners. Is this the major stance from your side? If it is not, it shouldn’t come before your main rebuttals/arguments. It shouldn’t take the place of your Hook. * “Why not use these funds on crime prevention” is an interesting point. Can you point out more on where this large amount of money can be spent? * I think that the focus on prisoners having 1 cell each is not a very good way to attack the proposition; there are models that separate multiple people into one cell or apartment. This is therefore not very impactful. * When you argue that people may just enjoy life there and therefore not rehabilitate, you should be able to argue against the point that the Scandinavian prisons have a high success rate. * I think that you did not engage in good faith to the arguments of the proposition; the proposition’s best case is that people truly do reform and change their lives due to the opportunities; you must make sure to do the even if and take your opponents at their best case scenario. * Try to remain structured; be sure to get through your stance and counter-model at the beginning after your hook. If your model is using funds on crime prevention, explain what these policies are and how they will be successful. * The point about how a serial killer is living comfortably is a strong one.Good job. You can then connect it with the victim's point of view. How would someone’s family members feel when someone that destroyed their lives is living comfortably in prison? * What is the harm of the victims feeling upset over the comfortable prisons? Does this result in people not respecting the law, etc? * You need to make sure that you are impacting; also, make sure that you are telling me about what your case's benefit is; I think you were a bit too defensive in this speech!   Speaking time: 06:24.32, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Giselle |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the Scandinavian prison model. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * I feel that the rebuttals could address broader thematic issues. For example: the opposition side doesn’t solve the problem of fixing people. Their only solution is that ‘prisons are scary, therefore, people will commit less crimes’ on their side. But their side has much greater reoffence primarily because of how harsh prisons are on the inside, and how mismanaged they are. (And then elaborate further) * I like the focus of hopelessness in the hook; but I do think it is convenient to only focus on prisoners who are victims of circumstances. What about those who commit crimes of passion? * Good signposting and pacing! * Rebuttals: I think that you want to make sure that you are hitting the logic of the other side first. The reason for this is because they could be wrong on the facts, but right on the logic, and therefore still correct. You need to make sure that you are debunking both the facts and the logic! * I understand the idea behind pointing out examples like Singapore where it isn’t amazing in the prison but it is healthier and safer comparatively. But, Singapore is still relatively harsh compared to the actual model - and saying that it is somewhat harsh only helps the opposition as you’re saying they could be right! * When you say there’s less violence in the Scandinavian prison model, acknowledge why it is higher on the opposition side, and what is it that your side has that causes the prisons to have much less violence. Only then the justification would be highly convincing. * When you say that people don’t have to join prison gangs on proposition side, keep in mind that the opposition isnt supporting gang presence. You need to mention why it is the case that your model has been able to discourage gang presence in prisons. * Try to make sure to explain what these skills and programs are when you are explaining that people can be doing better and will rehabilitate as a result of the policies, * Try to make sure that you are explaining why these gangs exist in non-scandinavian prisons and how they gain members due to the conditions of a harsh prison. (E.g., not enough resources or safety, so you need to join a gang to protect yourself, etc.) * Try to be a bit more animated and confident when you are speaking; I feel that this speech was quite monotonous! * A lot of the content in this speech was quite similar to Amanda’s arguments, try to make sure that you are adding a new perspective or reasons to existing arguments to gain the most speaker scores.   Speaking time: 06:13.89, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Ethan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the Scandinavian prison model. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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:**   * Good start. Commanding, concise and speaks well of the stance of your side. * Good dramatics at the hook! Keep that up! * I am still unsure about the idea that people will enter prison voluntarily; prison is still incredibly horrible due to a loss of freedoms, etc. * “Is the gov going to raise taxes just to sustain prisons that are expensive” can be a good point. Talk about less developed countries that aren’t ready to step in the Scandinavian prison model. * I think your speech can benefit a lot if you address the proposition’s critic of your case on the subject of - how prisons are just very bad for rehabilitation. Then you compare it with your side and suggest why that form of rehabilitation is either not effective, or cannot be performed in wide range of different places. * Try to make sure that you are actively telling me why the government will likely not have funds to create these prisons; is it really that expensive? Why so? * I feel that your energy dipped quite a bit after the hook; you gotta make sure to give the judges a baseline of presentation and dramatics to keep their attention! * Try to tell me about what the reaction of the public is going to be when we tax them further to build these prisons; will people feel like there is no point to the criminal justice system and or will this reduce trust within the system? What might some of the impacts of this be? * You need to make sure to really dislodge the idea of rehabilitation as this is one of the most crucial arguments of the other side. You can say that this version of rehabilitation does not quite take into account retribution, etc, therefore, this is a bad idea. * The point about increasing crime rates can be made better by incorporating wide range of examples. More illustration ended on this part.   Speaking time: |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Louca |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the Scandinavian prison model. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:**   * Good start and hook to the case! Good stage presence as well. Nice hand gestures! * Very good clarification about how Scandinavian prisons are. * Good signposting! * Good clarification about prison conditions. Maybe back it up by re-establishing what sort of conditions have been talked about from your side in the debate. * Good job addressing opposition’s weakness on the subject of crime prevention. However, take it a step further and provide a personal interpretation of it and re-claim the point. * The reason why a ‘good environment’ is healthy for people to change is still underdeveloped from your side. Try adding nuances to this subject to make it convincing. * Try to make sure that you are maintaining a good level of eye contact with the judges; you can also point out that the point of these prisons is just to not be inhumane and to provide inmates with as much help as possible. * Try to also make some strategic observations of the other side; you can point out that the opposition really does not have much of a case beyond just a few circumstantial cases and examples. * Try to make sure that you are actively also proving the benefits of your side; as much as whips are about tearing down the other side, it is also about proving that you ultimately won the debate or not. You want to make sure that you actively explain that your side is either significantly more true or important! * Try to tell us more about what happens in prison even under the scandinavian model; they still lose their freedom of movement, social lives, right to work wherever you want, etc. This is all quite a huge deterrent against going to prison itself! * Try to make sure that you also tell us about why your rebuttals have either made the case of the other side unbelievable, etc. * Time management is a bit of an issue; try to enter the clash around 2:30-3:00 maximum to get the most time to resolve why you won the debate! * As a third speaker, I suggest you also focus on categorizing things. Maybe identify the clashes and interpret them. * Try to make sure to highlight the characteristics of the Scandinavian model that really help make prisoners reform themselves; this really helps to establish multiple reasons for your argument to be true! * Good example of private prisons! Make sure to end the conclusion with explaining why you won the clash you mentioned and why that clash is the most important.   Speaking time: 06:31.16, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Luke |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement minimum racial quotas in the police force. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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 | | | | | |
| 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:**  Speaking time: 04:08.16, good work!   * The clarity of speech is good. * Most of your argument relies on showing that the minorities will not be qualified for the job; this is an assumption though. You gotta make sure that you show why we are likely to reduce standards to hire these minorities - could it be because the pool to pick from is very small? Could it be because minorities don’t want to join the force? * Good stage presence and hand gestures! * There is also another angle that you can consider in this debate; which is that minorities will become the face of the police force and used to shield the police from criticism. This could be because the police force always points to the fact that they have minorities in the force despite actions against minorities, etc. * I think more effort needs to be put into proving that people are going to believe that these officers are not competent; could it be because of existing racial narratives, fake news, misinformation, etc? Try to give yourself some padding or grounding to show that your argumentation has a potential to happen/be realistic. * Try to tell me about how the bias becomes worse perhaps; could it be because people now feel like they have a cover or excuse to be discriminatory? * There seems to be an assumption that lies on the extreme, i.e., on prop, the police does not know how to police as people that are selected lack competence Entirely. It is recommended that you respond to a more moderate/reasonable understanding of the prop’s case, i.e., there may be minor compromises on competence, however, its necessary to fight prejudice/stereotyping against minorities. The later half of the speech seems more corrected in regards to this point, so good job there. * The subject of ‘trust’ and how people view the police seems to experience a level of stagnation, as it isn’t being clashed in a way that takes the debate ‘forward’. This can be resolved by using unique examples and finding different ways to diagnose/identify the prop’s weaknesses, though keeping in mind that new arguments aren’t recommended at this point. |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Ethan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During times of emergencies, THW censor all information that endangers national security. |
| --- |

| 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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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 | | | | | |
| 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:**   * Nice hook! I like the way you zoomed into how this is about national security and crisis specifically. Try to make sure that you first tell me about why this context identification is super important! * Rebuttals; good identification of the other side - but try to make sure to compare the levels of panic between both sides. Both sides probably have some level of panic, but why is yours a lot better comparatively? * You want to make sure to identify why exactly it is the case that the clash identified is the most important one; try to also make sure that you are fist framing and telling me why it is the case that your argumentation is the most important and impactful first to begin with! * You can tell me a few reasons for why the government may not abuse its power; it could be because the government is still subjected to political considerations, etc. This will hurt their ability to get votes in the next election! * Try to also tell me why the government has the incentive to respond to negative allegations against them; this is because of a high level incident (E.g., a confrontation between authorities and citizens) occurs, the government understands that this could spread due to social media, etc. This makes it likely for the government to keep things transparent and clear! * Good hand gestures and pacing! * Try to make sure that you are actively comparing your side and theirs with two elements; truth and impacts. In general, you should attempt to prove that you are more truthful and more impactful than the other side! Bring up the specific things said and compare from there. * I wasn’t too sure about the anarchist angle; try to tell me why this is reasonable and likely first! * Try to switch up your tone and emphasis; you could do with a tone that is sharper and more assertive!   Speaking time: 05:00.05, good work! |
| --- |