| **Student Name:** Ava Yao |
| --- |

| **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: | NA (first attempt) | | | | | |
| 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 highlighting that prisons foster violence, and create more violent offenders. However - is this a problem we can also solve through reform? Our push should be centered on curating a problem that only abolition can solve - this would be the moral imperative; that prison is fundamentally inhumane, regardless of how nice the prison is.  Good work engaging in clear signposting!  Set-up   * If we think prisons should be abolished - they should be everywhere! Why only Brazil and the US? If we’re okay with some prisons, why can’t we just try to replicate this there? * Good work adding in additional steps we can take to ensure the prevention of crime. * What do we support instead? We’re missing a model!   Argument 1   * On the creation of violence, we should talk about how this means that rehabilitation doesn’t end up happening - recidivism actually increases. 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 can also run a moral argument, on how prisons are inherently inhumane, inflicting suffering and trauma. We should talk about how even the nicest of prisons put limits on rights we aren’t comfortable with.  Great work speaking clearly and cogently. We could afford to speed up ever so slightly, and introduce more variation in our tone, speed - using pauses for instance to break up important moments. Good use of hand gestures, we look and sound confident!  03:30 - great first attempt! I’d recommend watching a round from WSDC to help orient you with the jargon and structure of the debate. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **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 identification of the burden of retribution, but the phrasing and language used is not particularly high impact - 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.  Set-up has to come first. 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? If your first rebuttal is we have a model, and then your follow-up is it will come later - is that particularly effective?  Model   * There is symmetric fiat - they literally want to abolish prisons. Is reform more likely, or abolition? * I’m still unsure as to what prisons look like on your side of the house. Use the examples we talked about in class to illustrate.   + 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   * We need to justify why we’re talking about gangs and gun violence specifically. The thesis is unclear. The point to make is that even though theoretically we don’t want people to suffer, we need to protect society - we say this at the END of the argument, rather than the start. * Good examples to illustrate how harm exists - but have you established this as endemic? We need to say we’ll unpack why structural causes for crime persist, and then cover, poverty, racial conflict and divides and so forth; at present, the phrasing makes it sound largely just like examples. * 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.   05:30  Good job asking POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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.  Good clarifications on what you want. I want concrete examples of what these rehab systems look like - binding, compulsory rehabilitation. How do you deal with maximum security prisoners? Do we institutionalise them instead? How strongly are we committing to the concept of prison abolition?  Rebuttal   * The gun's response I don’t understand - you say this isn’t a consequence of abolition. Sure - but the harm still persists? * Is this a problem we can also solve through reform? Our push should be centered on curating a problem that only abolition can solve - this would be the moral imperative; that prison is fundamentally inhumane, regardless of how nice the prison is. * There is FIAT on Opp to reform; if you can ABOLISH - surely they have fiat to reform.   Argument 1   * Excellent incorporation of the lack of welfare leading to crime in the first place. We want to frame the criminal as the victim here, of a lack of life chances and opportunities. We want to explain how the only choice that existed for them was to commit crime. Following, explain how they then go to prison and become firmly rooted as criminals. * We assert the model as to how change occurs - we don’t provide mechanistic analysis. Explain how rehabilitation helps the people the government fails such that they opt for crime.   + What tools do they need to become productive members, how does rehab give them this?   + We should talk about community based support - giving them people and social lives outside of other criminals?   We must run a moral argument, on how prisons are inherently inhumane, inflicting suffering and trauma. We should talk about how even the nicest of prisons put limits on rights we aren’t comfortable with.  05:21 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening. We need to call them out - why can’t reform achieve all the things they want? Point out how your model can accommodate non-violent criminals and let them off freer, but for the more severe crimes and criminals - you have a solution, they don’t. We also 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.  Don’t fixate on funding and feasibility. The debate can’t happen if either side can’t generally pull this off. You’re being uncharitable! There is symmetric fiat - they literally want to abolish prisons. Is reform more likely, or abolition?  POI: You need to point out how they only care about the worst instances of prisons - they’re fine with them elsewhere! Surely this is them not meeting their burden.  Argument 1   * We need to justify why we’re talking about gangs and gun violence specifically. The thesis is unclear. The point to make is that even though theoretically we don’t want people to suffer, we need to protect society - we say this at the END of the argument, rather than the start. * Good examples to illustrate how harm exists - but have you established this as endemic? We need to say we’ll unpack why structural causes for crime persist, and then cover, poverty, racial conflict and divides and so forth; at present, the phrasing makes it sound largely just like examples. * We need to explain why this is the trade off the state must make - whose rights must they prioritise? Link to the harm principle! * On how people feel - this matters less; talk instead about victims here and what the greater purpose of the Criminal Justice System is.   We had good style today! We used pauses, varied our tones, and sounded more confident. We still have some pauses and stops in the middle, which compromise our fluency - but still a significant improvement!  By the end of this speech, I’m still unsure as to what prisons look like on your side of the house. Use the examples we talked about in class to illustrate. 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.  05:14 | | | | | | |