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

| **Motion**: This House would allow violent offenders to opt into Pavlovian conditioning as a substitution for prison time. |
| --- |

| 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:  Are they rotting in a prison? The crime you’re talking about, for the average voter intuitively, is fair recompense. Pick a more strategic example, or come at the problem characterisation in a different way.  Set-up   * Good on the nature of the decision; link this to the concept of intentionality and mens rea (the mental component of classifying an act as a crime). * How does this work? In what ways does this conditioning occur? How does it change the way in which a person operates? * The motion says it lets people choose. What implication does this have on the debate? * Burdens?   The overall direction of the case is unclear. What is wrong with the status quo, what is the point or purpose of the CJS and how is it fulfilled on your side?  Argument 1   * Did we spend time trying to identify the micro-burdens? * I buy that deterrence occurs. Why is this deterrence preferable to the comparative? * Why is it inherently wrong? Repetitive example. Explain WHY they deserve this choice! * Why is prison so uniquely condemning in terms of making this choice? You need to characterise the nature of prisons - that they are centers of violence, gangs and organised crime, you need to engage in violence to survive etc. At present, this claim is too assertive. * Recidivism, not recommitting.   When was the second argument?  Argument 3   * What is new about this argument?   We have to have safeguards against this being brainwashing, or inhumane. We need to explain how this is a targeted approach to modifying harmful behaviors. By associating violent impulses with negative stimuli, and prosocial behaviors with positive stimuli, we can potentially reprogram offenders' responses, reducing the likelihood of future violence. This is not about brainwashing; it's about providing a scientifically-backed pathway to behavioral change that traditional prison systems often fail to deliver.  06:54  Why is this the POI we chose to ask! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This House would allow violent offenders to opt into Pavlovian conditioning as a substitution for prison time. |
| --- |

| 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 work targeting the choice; don’t make it about how we are tricking them or coercing them but whether they deserve this choice in the first place given how they took away someone else’s choice, or that this is inhumane. Saying this will just challenge them in xyz different ways doesn’t achieve anything.  Set-up   * Is it true that this only applies to these two categories? Is it empirically true? You’re arbitrarily limiting the debate, without any justification of why this is true. * Don’t make it about immediately switching into the Nordic system, but introducing a more general focus on rehabilitation. * Clear burdens.   Rebuttal   * Path into society - on job offerings, isn’t this symmetric? Does this change in your world in any way? * The same comment as above on the two categories you talk about applies here. * Punish them for no model, and no explanation for how it gets implemented, don’t cook up responses on this being only for second time offenders. * POI: fair response.   Argument 1   * Categories comment still applies. * Focus on the positive comparative of rehabilitation!   The biggest argument for us to run in the debate is the morality of this - it involves manipulating an individual's psychological responses, potentially infringing on their fundamental right to mental integrity. The power dynamic between the state and the offender creates a coercive environment, even if explicit coercion is absent.  07:14 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Nathalie Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would allow violent offenders to opt into Pavlovian conditioning as a substitution for prison time. |
| --- |

| 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:  I need a clearer opening! You can’t say bro in your speech. Start by explaining how rehabilitation doesn’t work, or how the fact that this is a choice means that you apply this uniquely to the kinds of offenders that need this the most, who cannot be rehabilitated.  Rebuttal   * Good on what prison looks like; explain how even the best of prisons are going to lead to this. Engage directly with the Nordic model. Why is prison so uniquely condemning in terms of making this choice? You need to characterise the nature of prisons - that they are centers of violence, gangs and organised crime, you need to engage in violence to survive etc. At present, this claim is too assertive. * On the nature of the decision to commit crimes - link this to the concept of intentionality and mens rea (the mental component of classifying an act as a crime). * How does this work? In what ways does this conditioning occur? How does it change the way in which a person operates? * The motion says it lets people choose. What implication does this have on the debate?   Argument 1   * Build out the characterisation on the nature of prisons in greater detail as explained above. * Good on how this works; good explanation of the feedback loop. Explain how this aligns with the concept of reparative justice, or provides justified closure.   On weighing - integrate this into the argument, don’t make this a separate segment in your speech. Why do we want these people to be back into society faster - state how both sides want to achieve rehab, and then explain how you win on this metric.  The same on integrating analysis on stakeholders. Don’t make this a separate segment - this is not the way to structure your speech!  We have to have safeguards against this being brainwashing, or inhumane. We need to explain how this is a targeted approach to modifying harmful behaviors. By associating violent impulses with negative stimuli, and prosocial behaviors with positive stimuli, we can potentially reprogram offenders' responses, reducing the likelihood of future violence. This is not about brainwashing; it's about providing a scientifically-backed pathway to behavioral change that traditional prison systems often fail to deliver.  07:10 | | | | | | |