| **Student Name:** Conan Cheung |
| --- |

| **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.]  You can omit the greeting in the hook, aim for something high-impact rather than just the re-stating of your stance!   * Good job signposting your speech1   On the set-up:   * I appreciate the clear statement that rehabilitation is about solving the root problem behind why crimes are committed.   + Rather than just throwing out the example of job training, state EVERY policy mechanism you’d like to include as part of your rehabilitative model. * We should acknowledge the broad comparison of the debate, and point out what the Opposition should defend as a policy comparison.   + Which side defends the prison model? This isn’t clear. * We should restate the burden/stance here, and WHY that is the most important thing in the debate.   On the first argument:   * Well done characterising poverty as the largest motivator behind crimes of theft!   + It would be a better idea to explain the thesis statement of the argument first, and explain why deterrence does NOT solve MANY true motivations behind crime.     - Give me other types of reasons why criminals commit crimes, then connect the dots as to what rehabilitation addresses it. * Good job incorporating the evidence I gave you on high recidivism and why the prison system fails, can we first link it as to why this failing prison model is a byproduct of OTHER goals of punishment, e.g. deterrence, retribution, etc?   + We briefly mentioned prison gangs, can you explain why a deterrence model is the only version where the prison gangs thrive? * We went back-and-forth to the examples of job training and therapy, if we restructured all of this so that there is less repetition, this argument would be a lot more cohesive.   + The examples of success should not be a replacement for logical reasoning, can you analyse for me things like counselling is actually quite effective in solving behavioural and psychological issues?   I like the premise that rehabilitation becomes more cost-effective in the future, is this a separate second argument, or just a pre-emptive rebuttal?   * We can point out that embracing retribution and deterrence is precisely why the government has limited political capital and resources to fund an effective prison model!   We can work on having a clearer speech structure and transitions.  Good job offering POIs!  5.01 - Good timing! | | | | | | |