| **Student Name:** Dana Chung |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  Well done pushing back on why the competing goals of punishment do matter to the justice system, e.g. victims suffering from the harms of the actions of criminals, despite having no malice.   * The point is left hanging here, can we explain the repercussion of ignoring all of these other stakeholders? Why will this cripple the overall goals of the justice system?   We need to signpost our speech as 3rd, what are the clashes?   * We eventually did later on, but done inconsistently.   Very good focal point on why uniquely deterrence focuses on prevention of crimes of the first instance!   * We can be comparative here and explain why this is more meaningful to prevent, than repeat offenders. Otherwise, Prop still wins on scale due to the high rates of recidivism.   + Point out that your side can integrate rehab into your punishment, so we can also deal with repeat offenders. Whereas Prop has to sacrifice all other goals to protect rehab.   I appreciate you being the first speaker to mechanise precisely why rehab is difficult to measure.   * While it is true that SOME people cannot be rehabilitated, is this largely true for most criminals?   + Explain why your model exclusively deals with this group of people.   + Well done pointing out that you still have some version of rehabilitation.     - However, how do you gain the political capital and resources to fund your prison systems when you are encouraging things like retribution?   On your second clash:   * Well done connecting the points to a state obligation to specific actors in society! * However, we are asserting that only maximum punishment is helping the victims move on, can we analyse the psyche of the victims, and why is it that only one kind of punishment can give them peace of mind? * We need to be comparative and explain why our obligation to victims OUTWEIGHS any other competing goals of punishments. We are saying it’s important in a vacuum.   We cannot enter a third new clash with one second to go! Cut your losses and conclude.  Please offer more POIs!  5.38 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |