| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Why are we starting the debate on Opp’s terms? You should start on your terms, explaining how or why tough on crime is the only way forward.  Set-up   * I think we need to go into detail on the range of tough on crime policies available to us. 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. It can also be financial! * Don’t make it about countries per say, but rather break down how debilitating organised crime is there, to necessitate this kind of intervention. You should make the victims the communities and areas, and the people who live within them that are constantly subject to violence and aggression, and how these are the people we need to save by saving the environment. * 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. Fair on rehabilitation and how unlikely it is to achieve - but this should be analysis coming out within an argument. Don’t start arguing in set-up.   Argument 1 - this is a negative argument about rehabilitation being bad, rather than a positive argument about why tough on crime works. You’re shadow-boxing a case!   * The thesis is that public perception matters? The thesis should be what you will prove! * Perception of what? Prisons, gangs, which one? This is coming across unclearly. * If prisons have been normalised as bad - then are people still scared of going? I’m confused by this 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? * What is the impact of this argument?   Argument 2   * Please no Tyrone! * The mechanism of fear is symmetric! It’s the same mech as above.   We’re not explaining how tough on crime solves any problems! We need to explain how this changes the above; how do we remove their capacity to inflict fear into the hearts of people, how do we remove their financial ability, how do we attack the masterminds? We can also explain how different gangs and organisations fighting against each other can be a means to dismantling the organisation as well.  We should explain how this restores the trust the community has in law enforcement, and why it did not exist prior.  06:15 - you were more focused and slower today - well done! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  The opening needs to be clearer; point out how they have provided NO explanation as to what the benefit of a tough on crime approach is. Explain why this means they cannot win the debate. Then, go onto clarify your stance. Here - explain how or why organised crime proliferates; we tend to approach our analysis with so much preamble!  Good on how this turns people against law enforcement and the state; good on desperation. Explain how if this is a debate about dismantling the chokehold of organised crime, Prop loses - they have no positive case!  POI - explain they don’t have a choice! They see the state as punishing them, and the gang as feeding them. We should also explain how the hierarchy means that this punishes only the ones at the lowest of the ladder. Talk about how this is the poor, the youth - the very people we want to protect the most. These are victims that they want to save!  Model? We should say we’ll take a community based approach; invest in poverty alleviation programs, education and so forth. This isn’t clear. Your stance on what you support is also unclear. Don’t randomly bring up your model in a POI as 1st Opp; they’ll hear it about in your speech. This leads to confusion.  Rebuttal: public perception; do these people fear the gang more or the police more. Who has the ability to ruin their life more?  Argument 1   * Look at the war on terror and drugs launched in the late 1900s and early 2000s; was this successful? 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. 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. * You have to characterise how exactly organised crime takes action. Use examples here to illustrate what this looks like; good on dependency. You need to explain why they join, and why they will continue to join because of the power these groups have over them. * Good on prisons and what they are likely to be like.   Argument 2   * This is contingent on the first argument being true. * You can also 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. Who are they likely to turn to when they can’t get proper jobs? * 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.   Drop the sweeping statement/checklist type of conclusion.  06:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Choi |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What does the opening call out do? You need to get to the point and give me a positive case! So far, the push from Prop has just been that rehabilitation is bad; there’s no explanation as to why tough on crime works.  Rebuttal   * We offered no responses. We called their speech messy, and that we didn’t understand anything, but their case still stands! * There isn’t a contradiction here; you’re summarising what they say and that it didn’t make sense, but this isn’t a rebuttal. He says that people are dependent on gangs and tough on crime alienates people from the state, who turn further to gangs. * We’re not explaining how tough on crime solves any problems! We need to explain how this changes the above; how do we remove their capacity to inflict fear into the hearts of people, how do we remove their financial ability, how do we attack the masterminds? We can also explain how different gangs and organisations fighting against each other can be a means to dismantling the organisation as well. * We should explain how this restores the trust the community has in law enforcement, and why it did not exist prior.   Argument 1   * Is tough on crime compatible with Scandinavian prisons? This is slightly confusing, on gang culture existing in prisons, you need to explain why it goes away. The most militarised of prisons in status quo have gang culture within. We say police presence means it goes away. You have to do a lot more work here! Why do prisons solve the problem of organised crime? Who do you lock up on your side? Do you get the kingpins, or do you get common drug mules?   Argument 2   * 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?   I think we need to explain how debilitating organised crime is there, to necessitate this kind of intervention. You should make the victims the communities and areas, and the people who live within them that are constantly subject to violence and aggression, and how these are the people we need to save by saving the environment.  I think we need to go into detail on the range of tough on crime policies available to us. 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. It can also be financial!  We’re not making eye contact, and we’re eating so many of our words! We need to slow down and have more control over our speech!  06:02 | | | | | | |