| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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: | 67 | | | | | |
| 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:  The opening needs to be clearer! I appreciate the analogy, but you could be more direct in terms of what the core concern with organised crime is such that it requires a tough on crime approach.  Set-up   * Fair on the type of countries this debate is about; why do we think it may be more pertinent there? You could talk about how debilitating organised crime is there, to necessitate this kind of intervention. Spend more time on the problem characterisation. * On model, explain what the alternatives are likely to be; push a burden onto them; what do they have to support? Remember that they also have to present an alternative where we get rid of or break down organised crime groups; create urgency. * There’s no point to saying stakeholders for the sake of them! This is slightly random analysis here - but you do need to establish why or how the youth are affected in the status quo. We say that they are, but need to say WHY.   Argument 1   * I still don’t have analysis on how or why the youth are affected. Why are they likely to end up joining a gang? This is all entirely assertive! * You can say:   + Organized crime groups often target vulnerable youth for recruitment, exploiting their economic hardship, lack of opportunities, or desire for belonging. They may be lured into drug trafficking, gang activity, or other criminal enterprises with promises of money, status, or protection.   + Youth living in communities affected by organized crime are at increased risk of witnessing or experiencing violence, leading to trauma and long-term psychological harm. They may also be pressured to join gangs for protection or face retaliation if they refuse. * What is the impact of this argument? * Don’t young people get affected adversely by this motion? Don’t they get thrown into jail, or expelled from school as a result of this? How do we actually help them?   Argument 2   * What do we mean by public support? How does this lead to change? What kind of impact does this have? * Is this different from a war on these groups? Why are these harms not applicable to your side?   You have to keep speaking if you run out of material. In a competition, will you just wrap up if this occurs?  05:00 - I don’t want to see a repeat of this. You have to be able to keep going. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening; excellent focus on those at the bottom of the ladder. Good! Talk about how this is the disadvantaged youth Marvis talks about.  Set-up  Good on hierarchy. Good work characterising how exactly organised crime takes action. Use examples here to illustrate what this looks like; good on henchmen.  Good work responding to who is being impacted the most here; explain what kind of power these organised groups have in these communities and neighbourhoods. How they have cops on the payroll, embedded spies/plants, arms prevalent in these communities etc.  Good work explaining how and why they end up joining. All this analysis needs to be linked to the kind of framing coming from Prop and challenging it.  On model - how will you implement rehabilitation? We should say we’ll take a community based approach; invest in poverty alleviation programs, education and so forth.  Rebuttal  Explain that you also want to protect the youth - make it about which side actually achieves this.  POI: explain how this creates a permanent underclass; long prison sentences can make it difficult for individuals to find employment and housing after release. This can lead to further marginalization and increase the likelihood of reoffending. Good on alternatives on the basis of desperation existing.  Argument 1 (horrible time split, you started this at 5!)  Excellent thesis.  Characterise these areas and neighbourhoods; a lot of the analysis as to who these people are is repetitive.  Good on how this creates more victims for these groups; how it positions them to buy into their message even more so. We needed to flesh this out in way greater detail! Explain what prisons are like, what kind of relationship communities have with law enforcement and so forth.  Impacting and weighing missing!  07:13 - our style was off! We sounded super tense - the timbre of our voice was very high and we were speaking too fast. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Nathalie Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  You need to address from the get go what your winning/losing issue is, which is the bottom of the ladder, and the disprivileged youth your first speaker talked about. This ends up becoming your first rebuttal, but should be dealt with up top.  Why will people think in the way you claim? Why is their fear of the judicial system greater than their fear of the organised group? Do they have no competing incentives that they would weigh or value more?  Good push on how recruitment suffers. Explain why they depend on recruitment to thrive and survive.  Characterise why the system works! It’s not just punishment - tougher sentences, stricter enforcement, and increased surveillance can deter individuals from joining or participating in organized crime. Explain how the potential for severe consequences can make the risks outweigh the perceived rewards.  POI - fair on time, but the response you want to give is that this is a TRADE OFF you are happy to bite. The victims here are not the henchmen, but the community subject to the extreme violence and aggression; talk about what it means to live in communities or neighbourhoods where there is organised crime presence.  Argument 1  Explain how you actually take the gang down! You need to explain how you target the group in the way you are claiming.  Aggressive law enforcement tactics, such as asset forfeiture and RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act) prosecutions, can dismantle criminal organizations by targeting their financial infrastructure and leadership. If we break down the different tough on crime policies which exist on our side, we can claim lots more benefits. Even if a gang's activities are difficult to prosecute directly, they are often vulnerable to tax evasion charges. Investigating their finances and demonstrating unreported income can lead to convictions and further asset forfeiture.  On twice the amount - you should refer to this as ‘double jeopardy’.  07:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  LOOK AT ME IN THE OPENING. YOU ARE READING IT OUT! YOU ARE ALSO NOT MODERATING YOUR PACE, VOLUME OR TONE IN ANY WAY - WHAT YOU HAVE WRITTEN DOWN IS GREAT, BUT IT IS NOT MAKING THE IMPACT IT COULD.  Link the opening to the problems in DPM - how are they perpetuating the system that has failed you? This isn’t just a problem of status quo, this is a problem that you have to say they make worse.  POI: good on failure of systems. Explain what these systems are that have failed - the constant pursuit of tough on crime policies; use examples from the war on terror that have submerged communities into shoot offs, school closing and so forth. You should explain how this has made the relationship between these communities and local law enforcement far worse. We can even argue that tough on crime drives the desperate into the hands of organised groups further; it positions them to buy into their message even more so.  Rebuttal: On making it worse; fair. How do you make it better? What is the comparative? We should say we’ll take a community based approach; invest in poverty alleviation programs, education and so forth.  Argument 1  Good work structuring the harms these people are subject to. Explain how this creates a permanent underclass; long prison sentences can make it difficult for individuals to find employment and housing after release. This can lead to further marginalization and increase the likelihood of reoffending.  Clear explanation of how prisons function, and how this entrenches them further. Clear explanation of how these aren’t the criminals as OG characterises them to be. You should explain, on the flip, why these victims of circumstance are the ones who end up in jail, not the masterminds. You do end up saying this, but right at the end.  You should characterise here how exactly tough on crime can work here - prosecutors often rely on plea bargains and informant testimony to secure convictions. Low-level members, facing lengthy sentences, may be pressured to plead guilty to lesser charges or provide information on higher-ups in exchange for reduced sentences. This perpetuates the cycle of targeting the vulnerable while the masterminds remain elusive.    07:55  Our style needs serious attention! We have to make sure we’re actually altering our tone, variation and so on. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia organisations) |
| --- |

| 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:  I want a more meaningful opening. Use your opening to characterise what the clash between OG and OO is, and where your extension fits in. How will your extension change my perception of the round?  You’re not supposed to set-up per say; instead say - three things I want to establish; or - I want to characterise what these groups actually look like because our opening doesn’t really do this. Criticise them, don’t rebut them.  On this characterisation, good work explaining how embedded these groups are; but point out how this is new analysis! You need to focus on the value establishment.  Why do you get the higher ups? This is a great impact, I’m not sure why you achieve this? See the POI Annabel asks you. This has tension with your characterisation - explain how competing groups have incentives to take each other out. Use examples here to illustrate how this would work.  On rebuttal - this should be integrated into your extension; your extension should be responsive to the needs of the debate. Good mitigation on recidivism and how likely it is!  On the trade off, explain that the real victims here are not the henchmen, but the community subject to the extreme violence and aggression; talk about what it means to live in communities or neighbourhoods where there is organised crime presence.  Extension   * How do you take down the skilled members? If they’re rare and hard to come by, how do you catch them? Why do they flip? If they’re so committed and trust takes so much time to build, why would you be able to flip them or scare them, especially because as you say - the gang has access to their families etc. outside said individual in the hands of law enforcement? * Why will people think in the way you claim? Why is their fear of the judicial system greater than their fear of the organised group? Do they have no competing incentives that they would weigh or value more? Bribery here is in tension with above! Why on earth would we catch them then? * Focus on different ways to interpret tough on crime: aggressive law enforcement tactics, such as asset forfeiture and RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act) prosecutions, can dismantle criminal organizations by targeting their financial infrastructure and leadership. If we break down the different tough on crime policies which exist on our side, we can claim lots more benefits. Even if a gang's activities are difficult to prosecute directly, they are often vulnerable to tax evasion charges. Investigating their finances and demonstrating unreported income can lead to convictions and further asset forfeiture.   The tension undermines some solid analysis and characterisation! We’re not doing any explicit weighing or team comparison! You have to do this in BP! Why is your extension valuable?  07:11 | | | | | | |