| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **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.]  Nice tie back to what is the overall goal and purpose of the criminal justice system, we can bring the point even further with the strategic use of illustrations.  On the counter set-up:   * Well done pointing out that the Scandinavian model has a win-win integration for both rehab as well as deterrence. * I appreciate the characterisation of what the model looks like, but this is no different to what Prop has said.   + It would be more strategic to explain what Prop’s counterfactual SHOULD look like, then engage in some burden pushing. * What is your burden/winning pathway?   Good job signposting at the start.  Well done clarifying that the Scandi model still has maximum security prisons, but how do we engage to their point that your system still allows prisoners to leave?   * Add a mech to explain that this isn’t a privilege given to ALL, especially not those who pose maximum risks to society.   Good job responding to the point about how rehabilitation takes criminals to a cycle of violence. However, the explanation could include better illustration. Consider incorporating relevant examples. Also, try covering a wide range of opinion as a response. For example: how American prisons have several non-violent inmates that have been forced to join prison gangs, participate in violence as self-defense, etc. Prisons as such are a breeding ground for violence.   * We are focusing on the main trade-off right away without actually taking down any of her independent points on deterrence or retribution.   On your main argument of rehabilitation:   * I appreciate your attempt to frame criminals as also broader victims of society, but this premises cannot just be contingent on impoverished people. Tack on all of the other structural failures that lead to this cycle of discrimination. * We are burden pushing that Prop cannot defend rehab, but there isn’t clear mechanistic analysis as to why Prop cannot accomplish this.   + We cannot have broad reference to rehab mechs, we need to explain for EACH one, why a non-Scandi model cannot achieve this.     - E.g. If they want retribution, they are not meant to improve living conditions, and these prison conditions are instrumental to prisoners feeling like they’ve retained their humanity in this process.   The point about jobs is insightful. However, you can broaden it. For example: very few ex convicts are able to find jobs after finishing their sentence. This produces a cycle where they are forced to go back to participating in criminal activities. Producing an opinion as such would help communicate the ‘impact’ better.  Good job offering POIs!  5.09 - Good timing! | | | | | | |