| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Prep a hook for your speech, don’t just dive right into the meat of things.   * I also need signposting for clashes since you’re doing whip in this debate, rather than going into individual debaters.   Well done re-characterising that your prison model can also integrate elements of rehabilitation, but bear in mind that you’ve actively criticised the rehab model. So we have to carefully play the middle line, and explain why only your versions of rehab doesn’t contradict the original model of what prisons ought to be.  The inclusion of examples while responding to the opponent’s arguments has been done well in different parts of the speech. Good job!  I appreciate the pushback that a low-retribution model leads to greater ostracisation overall for these criminals, thus worsening stigma.   * But the impacting of this argument cannot only be grounded in theory, bring back the examples we discussed on society refusing to accept specific criminals post-punishment due to insufficient justice delivered.   + We then need to tie it back to how this then defeats Opp’s main goal of rehabilitation. Explain that its goal is for reintegration, which is undermined by the rehab model as well.   While responding to the POI, going back to the ‘mindset of the people’ idea wasn’t the best response. It is quite unclear what your stance is while responding to the POI.  When you mention that it takes an enormous amount of time to fix a person, you must engage with the opponent’s idea that Scandinavian prisons have a very high success rate. Maybe argue how the Scandinavian model might work only for a very narrow group of people, and for the broader context of the world, it isn’t relevant or functional.  The point about Deterrence is very under-developed. Spend some more time re-stating your side’s stance on the subject, and try comparing it with the opposition side. Make sure to use examples and analyze the subject better.  Instead of going into clashes at the 3rd minute, integrate rebuttals into your clashes.   * It isn’t clear what your counterfactual is, or what are the broader goals of the justice system that ought to be prioritised over the other.   + E.g. On improving social safety via incarceration, 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 retribution, I appreciate the reinforcement 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.   Please offer more POIs!  5.28 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |