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

| **Motion**: This house supports vigilantism in high crime areas. |
| --- |

| 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:  How have they been failed? Why do they feel unsafe? These are the right things to say, but without an unpacking of why it leads too much to vagueness.  Set-up   * Good identification of a failed CJS - link this to why the CJS has failed, such that it is harder for Opp to explain why they can just re-establish law and order in this area. * Give examples of what this vigilantism looks like, and explain why it will occur reasonably, as opposed to devolving into the complete breakdown of law and order. You might want to do this by framing the status quo as already being a broken society - we aren’t breaking it further, we are restoring it. * For instance, what structures will the community follow?   + Will they be trained to use weapons?   + Do they have their own community courts?   + Will they turn against their own members who abuse vigilantism as a way to also commit crimes?   Argument 1   * When we characterise this as low-trust, is it that we don’t know who hurts us, or that we’re aware of who hurts us, we just don’t trust the state to save us. * Why will the community be successful? * Explain why the state has failed them in these areas, and why those reasons don’t apply to the community vigilantes. Otherwise, I’m not sure why the community will be successful when the well-funded police couldn’t do it. * Yes, they feel safer and feel more trusting, but why are they the only actor who can take action? Point out that the right to security must be delegated to private actors if the state fails to protect their human rights. * Do we prove success?   Argument 2   * Good on how justice system has failed them - why and how? Why can’t they go to law enforcement? * Insufficient explanation - time division needs more attention!   You’re eating words! Slow down, focus on tone and delivery please!  05:11  We’re missing a huge argument on deterrence - the presence of visible vigilante activity can deter potential criminals, as the risk of apprehension and punishment (even extrajudicial) increases. Criminals may choose to avoid areas where they believe vigilantes are active. | | | | | | |

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

| **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 initial call-out. Good immediate follow-through; when we analyse how the CJS fails, how do we fix this? Fair on how people are self-interested - but explain why abuse is likely to occur. It isn’t just that certain character traits that lead to harm may exist, explain and walk me through how exactly vigilantism spirals out of control.  Where does organised crime and the mafia come from? You have to stick to a clear and controlled call out, rather than one which ends up covering a lot of other stuff.  Where is our counter set-up? Where is our characterisation of status quo, as well as our counter-model of how exactly we solve the problem?  Argument 1   * First establish why organised crime is what is running rampant, to explain how it is unlikely for vigilantism to ever succeed. Your argument is contingent on this characterisation. Then explain why it is impossible for the most well-intentioned vigilantes cannot take sufficient action - then explain why most vigilantes will not be well intentioned. * On the POI - you do have a positive burden! You have to provide a positive pathway to a safer community or tackling crime!   Argument 2   * Why is the violence so widespread, or how does it become widespread? Why do these families or communities get involved? The characterization lacks justification.   We need to make sure we are breaking down our characterisation in far greater detail, rather than asserting what the world looks like - especially where our characterisation of what a high crime area is differentiates from what the other side prevented.  We have to do counter set-up as 1st Opp. It is a crucial speaker responsibility.  05:13  We need to push how this perpetuates cycles of violence, undermines the legitimacy of the CJS - and condemns these communities to crime and violence forever. You have to explain how your side breaks this cycle! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 a more valid society? Your case is contingent on success. Marvis spends a lot of time explaining why it is unlikely for vigilantes to succeed against organised crime groups. Resolve why they will be able to do it very clearly! You respond by explaining how vulnerable the stakeholders are, but I believe that - I don’t believe that your side is able to help them.  We referenced the right to protect ourselves, but we didn’t connect this right as the extension of the right to life!  We should call Marvis out for not pursuing any positive burden on how their side solves this problem. Explain how they have no solution; explain why your version of the world is better. You might want to do this by framing the status quo as already being a broken society - we aren’t breaking it further, we are restoring it.  Extension? This is a WSDC speech, not BP.   * How have they been failed? Why do they feel unsafe? These are the right things to say, but without an unpacking of why it leads too much to vagueness. * Give examples of what this vigilantism looks like, and explain why it will occur reasonably, as opposed to devolving into the complete breakdown of law and order. For instance, what structures will the community follow?   + Will they be trained to use weapons?   + Do they have their own community courts?   + Will they turn against their own members who abuse vigilantism as a way to also commit crimes? * Good on how the justice system has failed them - why and how? Why can’t they go to law enforcement? Explain why the state has failed them in these areas, and why those reasons don’t apply to the community vigilantes. Otherwise, I’m not sure why the community will be successful when the well-funded police couldn’t do it. * Yes, they feel safer and feel more trusting, but why are they the only actor who can take action? Point out that the right to security must be delegated to private actors if the state fails to protect their human rights. * Do we prove success?   Why didn’t we ask any POIs?  We’re missing a huge argument on deterrence - the presence of visible vigilante activity can deter potential criminals, as the risk of apprehension and punishment (even extrajudicial) increases. Criminals may choose to avoid areas where they believe vigilantes are active.  05:13 | | | | | | |