| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This House believes that rehabilitation should be the only consideration in criminal 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: | 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 5 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the clarity in the hook, but we’re lacking impact! Try using illustrations to drive the same point home instead.  Good job recharacterising the prison conditions being counterproductive towards rehabilitation.   * Can you clarify why Prop’s team can exclusively claim these Nordic prison models? Opposition claims that they’re the ones who can integrate rehab into their systems, but your side has to prioritise rehab and reject prisons. * Please link it as to why this failing prison model is a byproduct of OTHER goals of punishment, e.g. deterrence, retribution, etc?   After conceding that there is a small group of people rehabilitation would not address, try to engage in some strategic framing as to why these people should be excluded from the round.   * Explain that the motion presumes these are people who COULD be rehabilitated.   We need to engage with Opp’s criticisms on rehabilitation being impossible to measure!   * What does rehab look like in your world? Point out that parole officers and psychologists are experts who can measure whether or not rehabilitation works.   What is the thesis statement of your argument? It isn’t clear what you are proving.   * Good analysis that deterrence has many logical holes, such as people who are hoping to get away with the crime.   + Can we then flip this and explain why rehabilitation is a meaningful way of actually shaping their moral compass as individuals? * There’s a lot of rhetoric on human dignity and ethics, but it’s unclear why any of these things are linked to the purpose of the justice system, or WHY it ought to be prioritised in the debate.   + The criticism of retribution is actually just a defense of rehabilitation, can we explain why society is harmed by prioritising its need for blood vengeance?   We need to work on our speech structure, it isn’t clear what is the logical flow of thought and what is it that you’re proving in the round.  Please offer more POIs!  6.20 | | | | | | |