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

| **Motion:** This house opposes 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 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 clarification on what the original purpose of prisons are, we can make this even more high-impact by highlighting specific traits of the Scandinavian model that makes them counterproductive to this original purpose.   * We can also frame why we think this purpose is irreplaceable and ought to be prioritised. * Good clarity at the start. The stance was clearly stated. Good work!   On the set-up:   * Good job defining what the model looks like, to elevate this, we should also highlight the comparative of the debate and what is your counterfactual model. * We need some strategic caveats on how to defend the failures of your conventional prison model!   + Can you suggest how we can integrate rehabilitation and education into your prison model without sacrificing the purpose of original prisons? * What is your burden/winning pathway?   The first argument about deterrence is well established, however, the points as well as the examples used are somewhat general.   * Consider focusing on nuances, such as: how societies with large levels of inequality would view this model as unfair and biased? Provide more examples of how people won’t be worried to commit petty crimes as the worst that can happen isn’t that bad.   Try utilizing relevant technical terms, such as retribution, punishment, rehabilitation, etc. This should help articulate your ideas with more impact.  Instead of combining every single purpose of punishment for prisons, i.e. deterrence and incarceration, we should structure multiple arguments, one for each purpose.  On the point of incarceration, good job highlighting the premise of safety risks, which may lead to more crimes.   * We need to explain why no amount of supervision will be adequate to mitigate these risks. * Instead of just claiming its importance, can we explain why protecting future victims via this pathway is more significant than protecting future victims via the reduction of crimes.   On the second argument of retribution:   * I appreciate the main claim that society is owed some kind of vengeance, it isn’t clear why everyone as a collective is owed this versus just the victims. Explain that every act of harm may traumatise everyone else and make them live in fear. Every criminal action also deteriorates our culture against criminal behaviour. * Both the arguments seem to be tied to the same thesis brought during the first argument. Try having the second argument distinct from the first in both the context as well as the impact. You can focus on: how Scandinavian models have a very narrow scope of where they work. They cannot be effectively applied to societies with higher levels of inequality. OR you can focus on how Scandinavian models focus on rehabilitation that doesn't work for specific types of criminals that require a much different form of prison system, etc. * The impacting of this argument cannot only be grounded in theory, bring back the examples we discussed on society ostracising these criminals due to insufficient justice delivered.   + We then need to tie it back to how this then defeats Opp’s main goal of rehabilitation and reintegration.   Good job offering POIs!  5.15 - Good timing! | | | | | | |