| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish all prisons |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  What are the inherent flaws? This is too vague! We need to be specific. Our opening needs to be better curated and phrased; for instance, tell me how high the rates of recidivism in the US are, which showcases that prisons are unable to rehabilitate or reintegrate.  Our push should be centered on curating a problem that only abolition can solve - this can also be the moral imperative; that prison is fundamentally inhumane, regardless of how nice the prison is.  Set-up   * Good work addressing the most extreme offenders; don’t say oh they can just go to mental asylums - we should say: we think everyone deserves the opportunity to begin again; we think this largely applies to the vast majority of criminals who aren’t gang members, extreme offenders; we would institutionalise the most extreme, violent offenders. Explain how the vast majority of crimes are not violent or extreme. * On the model itself, good work focusing on rehabilitation - we can add in details here on the open prison concept from Finland we talked about. * We need to add more into the model - if we want to take a preventive approach, we need to target the root causes of crime - we think about this when we say financial incentives, but the approach must be more expansive: investing in social programs and community resources etc.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? If you aren’t spending time structuring a skeleton for the argument before you start writing it, it will not have a logical flow or clarity. It is also unclear what outcome it is that you’re working towards. It is also likely your arguments will have overlap with each other. * We assert violence turns non-violent prisoners into worse individuals; we need to unpack how exactly prisons are inhumane, which rights they take away, and the kind of trauma they subject people to. We also need to explain why reform can’t alter this, or make this better. So far, all these harms are dealt with through prison reform. Your argument can’t just be that prisoners are bad - it is that they are so bad they are beyond being saved through reform. * We need to unpack why rehab works? Explain how exactly your model works, and then walk me through how someone’s mindset and behaviour changes.   Argument 2 - this is just the how you solve the problem; it isn’t another argument it is what the previous argument is missing; a positive comparative.   * We need to explain why reform is insufficient to solve this problem! * We can add analysis as to how this works. For instance, limited social interaction and the constant threat of violence within prison hinders the development of healthy social skills and conflict resolution strategies, making it more difficult for former inmates to navigate social situations peacefully.   We needed a principle argument explaining that all confinement is immoral!  06:10 - good work hitting time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish all prisons |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is this opening achieving? I need you to start by pushing the central framing from your side; what is this? Is it that prisons are necessary because they prioritise victim’s rights? Is it that their case is entirely not comparative because your side engages in reform?  Set-up   * Where is this? You have to explain what reform looks like on your side! * We need to know what kind of system you support instead; will you lock up non-violent offenders, will you only pursue violent prisoners, what kinds of reforms do you support? * For instance, Norwegian prisons, such as Halden Prison, which offer comfortable accommodations, extensive vocational and educational programs, and a high staff-to-inmate ratio to foster positive relationships between inmates and guards. * Most of your rebuttals explain that you don’t defend the world they have a problem with - this characterisation should have been done here rather than in bits and pieces.   Rebuttal   * Good on who is being prioritised; you just say victims also matter. You need to tell me why they matter MORE, and that this is the best way to uphold this! We should call them out - why is it the case that reform doesn’t solve all the problems they call out? They never explain why the rights of these prisoners matter more than that of the victims; weigh this explicitly! * Explain how hard it is to measure rehabilitation; your side tries to achieve this too, but in the immediate aftermath, prioritise victims instead.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis? That you achieve deterrence? * Why do people commit crime? You need to establish this first; do people just commit crime for fun, or is it more serious than that? Does anyone truly commit a crime just because the prison is nice and they don’t mind it? * What did you prove here?   Argument 2   * Good work establishing up top that public safety is at risk here. * We could have had an even higher impact by focusing on victims, and/or their families - to describe what the suffering they have inflicted on their victims looks like! Walk me through what a family feels like when they lose a parent to gang violence, or drug crimes. * We want to pinpoint who gets sidelined on Proposition - abolition will not address the needs of victims who seek justice and a sense of closure through the incarceration of perpetrators. * Why do victims matter more? Why does public safety matter more? Why is this the trade off the state must make?   05:33 - hit 6! You had thirty more seconds. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tiffany Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish all prisons |
| --- |

| 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:  What is this opening? The identification of WHY people commit crime is good; but focus on this, rather than the call out up top; the US example is good - open with this and break it down; and then point out the implication, and then move on.  Rebuttal   * Well no - they say there are a range of prisoners, some of them can be rehabilitated, others should be kept in jail for public safety. * The point is you institutionalise the worse, they still aren’t mixing with people. For the others, you know that prisons and confinement, even if it’s more humane than the status quo, doesn't work. * Clear on deterrence not working; explain why it DOES on your side. * Explain why rehabilitation in the context of isolation doesn’t work. If you are removed from society, how do you reintegrate into it? * How do you rehabilitate?   + The isolated environment of prison disrupts the routines and rhythms of normal life, making it difficult to adjust to the demands of work, family, and community responsibilities upon release.   + Prison isolates individuals from their families, communities, and support networks.   + Isolation can exacerbate existing mental health issues and even create new ones.   + The experience of isolation itself can be traumatic, compounding any pre-existing trauma that may have contributed to criminal behavior in the first place.   + The stigma of incarceration can make it difficult for individuals to secure employment even after completing these programs. * **We’re still engaging exclusively with the worst types of prisons. They’ve explained how they don’t support this. You need to engage with it!**   Argument 1   * Good work breaking down who commits crime, and then resolving on the basis of each group. * Good on change in living environment; good work analysing why people commit crime. * You need to explain how you prevent crime though; in the sense that those who go through your system can definitely recover, but what about those outside who are in these situations; is the only solution waiting for them to commit crime and then recover? * No prevention?   Our push should be centered on a problem that only abolition can solve - this can also be the moral imperative; that prison is fundamentally inhumane, regardless of how nice the prison is.  06:16 - good work hitting time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would abolish all prisons |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 simplest, but highest impact opening you can have is: what can abolition achieve that reform can’t? What is exclusive about their case?  Rebuttal   * Good clarification on the lack of mixing in your world. The version of prisons that they push you to defend is not the one you have to; they don’t engage with your model at all! * On why people commit crime; explain why you resolve this, but recognise that there are other competing priorities. We can’t single-handedly focus on this; we have to think of public safety and victims! * Explain how hard it is to measure rehabilitation; your side tries to achieve this too, but in the immediate aftermath, prioritise victims instead.   There were gaps in the set-up we needed to fill!   * We need to know what kind of system you support instead; will you lock up non-violent offenders, will you only pursue violent prisoners, what kinds of reforms do you support? * For instance, Norwegian prisons, such as Halden Prison, which offer comfortable accommodations, extensive vocational and educational programs, and a high staff-to-inmate ratio to foster positive relationships between inmates and guards.   Argument 1   * This is largely just a feasibility/implementation question; it’s one response at best, not an entire argument! * Why is the tax the singular tipping point to crime? * Why does deterrence work? Tiffany explains how it doesn’t, pointing to the US as an example - we didn’t engage with this at all! * We could have had a higher impact by focusing on victims, and/or their families - to describe what the suffering they have inflicted on their victims looks like! * Walk me through what a family feels like when they lose a parent to gang violence, or drug crimes. * We want to pinpoint who gets sidelined on Proposition - abolition will not address the needs of victims who seek justice and a sense of closure through the incarceration of perpetrators. * Why do victims matter more? * Why does public safety matter more? * Why is this the trade off the state must make?   06:07  Good work asking POIs!  Watch the Canada v Poland round from WSDC 2023; look at the Canadian second speaker specifically. | | | | | | |