| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **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:  Excellent opening highlighting who is at fault, and hence, who we need to focus on and uplift. Throughout this opening, we barely made ANY eye contact with the audience.   * However, is this true for ALL prisoners? You need to deal with this later on in the set-up. * Our push should be centered on the 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 focusing on rehabilitation - we can add in details here on the open prison concept from Finland we talked about. Good on rehab centre, parole, and monitoring. * 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. * How do we deal with the most extreme offenders? 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.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What exactly are we trying to argue? 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. 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:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Solid opening! Explain that this isn’t just a debate about non-violent offenders committing minor crimes - tell me who it is about instead!  Make the signposting speedier; you don’t have to say TWO rebuttals; keep the argument titles succinct and clear.  Set-up   * You can just say your side supports reform; and then spell out the details you do explain. Use more examples here of the kinds of policies you support; for instance, Norwegian prisons, such as Halden Prison, which offer comfortable accommodations, extensive vocational and educational programs etc. * How do you deal with extreme offenders? Maximum security, violent, severe crimes?   Rebuttal   * On why people commit crimes - don’t just cite the model; explain some people regardless of cause do it and that’s the reality we have to deal with/many commit it with knowledge. Link this to rights being taken away in the second rebuttal - there are goals beyond rehabilitation! For instance, public safety, victims and so forth! * 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.   As 1st Opp you cannot start your argument at 4 minutes! You have to make your set-up and rebuttal speedier.   * Establish how 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?   Argument 2 - at 05:07, this is too late. This should have been the singular argument you ran!  05:22  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening, the first thing to respond to is on the distinction between reform and abolition; can a prison ever be humane?  Rebuttal   * Why is this an infringement of their rights? You can’t assert freedom as a value; you have to explain why they have it, why it matters and so forth. * If you have the fiat to abolish, surely they can reform? The political capital both sides have access to is symmetric. * On making them go back - why is this bad? If they reoffend, what does your side do? * All of our responses are that freedom is important and it gets taken away - do you ever justify freedom?   POI: Why is all of this sufficient, comparable to being isolated and incapacitated?  Argument 1   * Explain HOW and WHY they are inhumane; and make this in context of what Opp’s model of reform looks like. **We’re just engaging exclusively with the worst types of prisons. They’ve explained how they don’t support this. You need to engage with it!** * How do you fix this? What does the comparative look like? You need to explain why rehabilitation in the context of isolation doesn’t work. If you are removed from society, how do you reintegrate into it?   + 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.   + 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. * Why do the freedoms you give them contribute to rehabilitation? * Why would Opp say this, and what is the purpose of the rollercoaster analogy?   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?  05:07  We need to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellen Lui |
| --- |

| **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:  Give me a proper hook! 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 - don’t structure the rebuttals speaker by speaker; organise it through issues/contributions/themes   * Explain how they have the fiat to abolish; you have symmetric fiat. You can do this. Why are we making this is a budget issue, rather than a public safety issue?   + Explain how hard it is to measure rehabilitation; your side tries to achieve this too, but in the immediate aftermath, prioritise victims instead. * You need to bring back your model, because 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 house arrest; good work targeting this! We also need to explain how there are goals beyond rehabilitation! For instance, public safety, victims and so forth! They never explain why the rights of these prisoners matter more than that of the victims; weigh this explicitly!   POI: you have rehab! You have vocational training! Those who can recover, do. Uniquely, your side deals with those who do not rehabilitate.  Argument 1   * Good on victims rights; good link to how they may feel due to a lack of recognition here. * We could have had an even higher impact by focusing on illustration - 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. * 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?   Clear tone, loud delivery.  We need to ask POIs more consistently!  05:07 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Davian Hung |
| --- |

| **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:  We need to ask POIs consistently. We have to demonstrate that we’re engaged in the debate!  Clash 1: Need v. Justified - Principle   * Opp doesn’t say it’s because of responsibility - it’s because they think public safety matters lots. The response isn’t to explain how people have been forced into crime, but to explain why their rehabilitation and freedom matters more than the potential victims they may have if they’re treated far more leniently? * POI: not that they don’t have social mobility, but that they don’t have a choice. The gang will hurt their families if they don’t! * This is a selective engagement - what about those who do commit crime with enthusiasm and agency? How do you deal with them? * Why does rehabilitation work? If you are removed from society, how do you reintegrate into it?   + 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. * Good work bringing back the model, in relation to parole etc.   Comparative - good on how this is a cycle they get stuck in; but this is still only engaging with the worse instances of prison. It doesn’t engage with Opp’s counter-model?  Clash 2: Principle - you can’t start this at 5:15, even in a 6 minute speech! Too late!   * Why is this an infringement of their rights? Your team can’t assert freedom as a value; you have to explain why they have it, why it matters and so forth. * If you have the fiat to abolish, surely they can reform? The political capital both sides have access to is symmetric. * All of the earlier responses were that freedom is important and it gets taken away - do you ever justify freedom?   05:21 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  The simplest, but highest impact opening you can have is: what can abolition achieve that reform can’t? What is exclusive about their case?  Call-outs   * House arrests - why is it that this is them supporting your side of the house? Why is it automatically wrong?   Clash 1   * What is more freedom in this context? Why does the rehab work? Why do the goals you achieve matter or are legitimate? How do you protect the rights of the public? You’re claiming all of this, but where is the analysis?   + Establish how 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? * Explain how hard it is to measure rehabilitation; your side tries to achieve this too, but in the immediate aftermath, prioritise victims instead. * Why are they wrong about the model? What does it even mean to be wrong about the model?   POI: What causes deterrence in the first place? You can’t say your side achieves this better without explaining why this is true.   * Sure, you have rehabilitation - WHY and HOW does it work? * On why people commit crimes - don’t just cite the model; explain some people regardless of cause do it and that’s the reality we have to deal with/many commit it with knowledge. Link this to there being goals beyond rehabilitation! For instance, public safety, victims and so forth! Link this to the HARM PRINCIPLE.   Was there a second clash?  05:17  How many POIs did you ask? | | | | | | |