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

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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’re eating your words in your opening and saying, in albeit different words, that Opp is bad. Is this specific and/or clear in terms of the problem statement?  Set-up   * Who are they? What kind of jobs have they done in the past? How do we appoint them? Is it one, is it a panel? What checks or balances exist against them? What happens if they mess up? How do we get rid of them? * Good on re-election incentives and majoritarian incentives. Explain why they are unable to, where given access to information, still unlikely to make the right decisions. Explain that the nature of electoral politics is such that it creates time limits, term limits, incentives to always change the policy of your predecessor. * Why are we talking about victims? Especially in set-up?   Argument 1   * You need to start by explaining what the difference between decision-making is; I’m not sure why the argument is starting by talking about victims. The push should be on the quality of the decision being made, not victims. Victims might want retribution, instead of rehab. You’re adding additional logical burdens on yourself to prove. * Good on why politicians are likely to be tougher on crime. Why do tough on crime policies not work? Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice. E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanises criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity. * We have to explain that there are certain policies which are good, but politicians will never implement because of how resource intensive they are - this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.   You need to establish what the nature of electoral politics is; assume that ideological biases and polarisation don’t exist and make this argument on the strongest possible grounds. Then introduce the realities of politics. What kinds of policies get passed in OO’s world that do not in yours?  We need to establish what the distinction between incentives is more systematically. Discuss the incentives of each group and how this impacts their decision-making. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking.  Rather than state that politicians are just not experts, explain the precise perverse incentive that tough on crime laws are populist and lead to easy votes.  05:35 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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 or proving?  You should call out how they never explain why victims want what they claim; your side can help victims too. Engage on this way and move on. You eventually do say this, but deal with this quicker! Why do elected reps have an incentive to listen to them?  You have to start by establishing what the biggest distinction between these two actors is; and what the nature of CJS policy is - that this isn’t like health policy, where there is a clear sense of what is right and what is not. These are subjective, moral choices and only people we give power to should have the power to make these choices in the first place.  Argument 1   * Good on how expert information is also accessible on your side. You have to explain why elected reps have an incentive to make use of this information. Don’t trade off knowledge. * Excellent on social norms - what is the implication of this? Can technocrats make this decision? Do we have any check or balance for technocrats on their side? * What did you prove at the end of this?   Argument 2   * Good on buy-in; we say this super roundabout. Explain WHY buy-in matters. What kinds of crimes require the public to engage?   Why are the public’s choices and approval so needed? You need to explain why their opinions are correct, or just or valuable! For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking amongst technocrats.  Democratic representation should have been the essence of your case!   * Why public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies, * Why criminal justice can only work when it reflects public sentiments, * The harms of criminal justice policies that are undemocratic.   05:16 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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, explain why technocrats do care.  Rather than victims, make it about the vulnerable. Explain why rather than it being that politicians are just not experts, explain the precise perverse incentive that tough on crime laws are populist and lead to easy votes. Explain why politicians have no incentives to listen to victims or vulnerable people.  Explain why they don’t have the **incentives** to behave in ‘good’ ways. For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking. Illustrate a FEW examples of tough on crime laws, then mechanise specifically why those exact policies don’t work in the context of criminal justice. E.g. Poor funding of prisons actively dehumanises criminals which forces them to embrace their criminal identity.  We have to explain that there are certain policies which are good, but politicians will never implement because of how resource intensive they are - this requires politicians to advocate for a voter group that has no political power at all. There’s no political returns for this policy.  Talk about special interests and lobbying! Explain why the citizens are incorrect or misinformed; it is stronger to argue that it isn’t even about the citizens, it is about special interests and lobbyists - this is the influence we seek to remove from politics.  It’s not like we’re asking these technocrats to take the role of judges in sentencing! This is about general CJS policy like whether we should be tough on crime or not, focus on rehabilitation etc.  Extension:   * What is new about this that you haven’t already said? The structure of this speech is super messy! You have to make it clear what issues matter and what you are winning on. We need to clean structure up a little bit more - try and identify 2-3 key issues, respond in that way.   06:16 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that criminal justice policy should be decided by technocrats rather than elected representatives |
| --- |

| 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:  Are these three things independent and distinct from each other?  What is wrong about this lack of model; are there checks and balances against these technocrats? How do we get rid of them? How will this be a transparent and accountable process?  **The opening is too long without a clear explanation of what the winning/losing issue in the round is.**  You have to start by establishing what the biggest distinction between these two actors is; and what the nature of CJS policy is - that this isn’t like health policy, where there is a clear sense of what is right and what is not. These are subjective, moral choices and only people we give power to should have the power to make these choices in the first place.  Information isn’t the response. Why they make decisions on the basis of this information is what matters! Explain why the policies that are being voted on and approved by the public are the good policies to begin with! Why are the public’s choices and approval so needed? You need to explain why their opinions are correct, or just or valuable!   * For instance, Tories who have to pander to conservative voters by being tough on crime and over policing minority neighbourhoods, versus more progressive and less discriminatory thinking amongst technocrats.   You should call out how they never explain why victims want what they claim; your side can help victims too. Engage on this way and move on. You eventually do say this, but deal with this quicker! Why do elected reps have an incentive to listen to them?  Democratic representation should have been the essence of your case!   * Why public opinion is actually correct when it comes to criminal justice policies, * Why criminal justice can only work when it reflects public sentiments, * The harms of criminal justice policies that are undemocratic.   We assert that politicians make good decisions, and help the vulnerable but to the extent this is a voting minority, why is this true?  05:21 | | | | | | |