| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  I appreciate the clarity on where you stand in the debate, we can use illustrations to make the hook less vague and more impactful.  Good pushback that prison conditions that resemble living conditions outside will hamper deterrence, but this is simply repeating P1’s argument.   * To make it more engaging, deal with Opp’s claim that this is crucial for rehabilitation and thus lower crime rates.   + We should explain that there are other alternatives to pursue rehab without removing the original purpose of prisons.   When you’re arguing about the significance of retribution, you can cover a wide range of ideas, such as: how is it fair for the victims to see their perpetrators live a super comfortable life inside the prison? How does the Scandinavian model ensure the fear of being charged with crime in societies where even as current systems prevail, the crime rates are very high. If rehabilitation fails, which it likely will in many places, what is the Plan B in the Scandinavian model?  There are several ideas in the speech that have added good value to the content. However, try exploring different examples (very specific in nature) so your arguments can showcase great impacts. For example: a serial killer than is unlikely to change or is always a threat inside or outside a prison, how does the scandinavian model provide him the punishment he deserves? The parents that have watched their child be harmed by perpetrators, how will they feel a sense of justice when the prison has a super comfortable bed, wifi and some freedom of movement?  I appreciate that we are reinforcing the specific point on safety risks, since this is the strongest argument from P1. We should engage with Opp’s claim that they still have maximum security prisons to minimise these risks.   * Point out that Opp cannot claim the benefits of rehab if they are limiting the access of benefits to very, very few prisoners. So they have to defend the majority of prisoners being able to leave. * 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 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. * 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.   Please offer more POIs!  5.15 - Good timing! | | | | | | |