| **Student Name:** Isabella Sun |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Well done clarifying the motion that the Opposition can balance ALL of the different purposes of punishment, and conclude your burden pushing properly that Proposition can ONLY defend rehabilitation and nothing else.   * To make this a better hook, frame this as a call-out! Opp can co-opt all the benefits of Prop’s model. Point out that Prop should not defend ANY models of incarceration. * Good job signposting.   The rebuttal that criminal records make it difficult to get a job is even WORSE on your side, while you are mitigating their benefits, the comparison doesn’t tip in your favour because you are giving them a criminal record, taking away their time, and exposing them to gangs in prison.  Good job pushing that the state ought to improve welfare systems and help the most vulnerable, this is precisely what you should highlight in your counterfactual and set-up.   * In comparison, explain why there is more political capital to do this than to fund rehabilitation models they proposed.   We are not engaging with Prop’s main premise on the effectiveness of rehab, and the failure of prisons!   * The criticisms towards rehab belong here instead.   On your first argument:   * While it is true that SOME people are innately bad and cannot be rehabilitated, is this largely true for most criminals?   + Explain why your model exclusively deals with this group of people, and you can still rehabilitate those who clearly can be rehabilitated. * It isn’t clear why reintegration is something that Opp does better!   + Even if Prop’s solution is not perfect, they are the closest thing towards addressing a solution.   Can we explain why you can spearhead better prison conditions, and why rehab can be integrated into your punishment model?   * We need a principle defense of things like retribution and deterrence, not just incarceration.   We need better time management, your argument started with one minute remaining.  Please offer more POIs!  5.23 | | | | | | |