| **Student Name:** Giselle Yap |
| --- |

| **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.]  I really like the moral rhetoric in the hook focusing on the protection of victims! We can use illustrations to really drive the point home.  Good job identifying that criminals are not deterred by rehabilitative models, but we are currently asserting this.   * Prop points out that they also have detention centers and prisons, why is this not sufficient? * We should make an observation and burden push Proposition to stop defending any model of incarceration.   I appreciate the response to the POI which is that deterrence focuses on prevention of crimes of the first instance!   * We can be comparative here and explain why this is more meaningful to prevent, than repeat offenders.   + Point out that your side can integrate rehab into your punishment, so we can also deal with repeat offenders. Whereas Prop has to sacrifice all other goals to protect rehab.   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 argument:   * Well done with your premise on protecting the innocence of victims.   + We are asserting that only maximum punishment is helping the victims move on, can we analyse the psyche of the victims, and why only one kind of punishment can give them peace of mind? * We need to be comparative and explain why our obligation to victims OUTWEIGHS any other competing goals of punishments.   Please offer more POIs!   * Well done asking Prop to give you a POI.   5.21 | | | | | | |