| **Student Name:** Tony Huang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports the Scandinavian prison model |
| --- |

| 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:  I like how imaginative the hook is, try linking everything back to the motion instead of explaining it in a vacuum.  On your counter set-up:   * I need to hear what your counterfactual is in this debate! * We need some strategic caveats on how to defend the failures of your conventional prison model!   + Can you suggest how we can integrate rehabilitation and education into your prison model without sacrificing the purpose of original prisons?     - E.g. Your conventional prisons can offer rehab, opportunities, etc without allowing them to leave and improving conditions to the level of dorms.   Interesting rebuttal to the POI that crimes rates are lower in Scandinavian nations due to population numbers, but she’s specifically referring to the rate of recidivism.  Instead of combining every single purpose of punishment for prisons, i.e. deterrence and incarceration, we should structure multiple arguments, one for each purpose.  On Scandi prisons being unsustainable, I appreciate the analysis of the opportunity cost. However, we are not considering whether or not the benefits of lowering crimes are worth the cost. We cannot just argue in a vacuum that healthcare is quite important, surely the human costs are lower as well when we fix issues pertaining to law and order.  On society not being able to accept these results, we should argue clearly that society is owed some kind of moral compensation due to the crime being committed.   * Explain that every act of harm may traumatise everyone else and make them live in fear. Every criminal action also deteriorates our culture against criminal behaviour. * The impacting of this argument cannot only be grounded in theory, bring back the examples we discussed on society ostracising these criminals due to insufficient justice delivered.   + We then need to tie it back to how this then defeats Opp’s main goal of rehabilitation and reintegration.   Well done on the loss of deterrence, but we’re not explaining why this cycle of criminality supercedes the one that Proposition has highlighted.   * We need to provide a focal point on specific instances in which deterrence is uniquely important, e.g. first-time offenders only respond to the severity of punishment. * We need to be more engaging with Prop stating that there are greater culprits behind criminal action, such as poverty and mental health issues. Does fear really matter for these people?   Good job offering POIs!  05:03 - Good timing! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Isabella Sun |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports the Scandinavian prison model |
| --- |

| 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:  We need a hook, Isabella! Instead of diving right into the clashes!  Instead of just clarifying that your team offers a lot of things that contribute to rehab, explain to the judge why the Opposition is not able to co-opt any of this!   * If the Opposition wants to fix this, then they lose their own principles of deterrence and retribution. * Point out what exactly are these underlying culprits behind the commission of crime, and how each of the mechs you’ve provided fixes this.   + E.g. There are criminals with aggressive and violent outbursts due to a traumatic upbringing, so mental health services directly target the root cause. * We are over-relying on the stats rather than giving me real mechanistic analysis as to why this outcome of effectiveness is likely.   Integrate the rebuttals INTO the clashes.  I appreciate the pushback on what are true culprits behind crime, we should actively rebut Opp’s claim here on how useful fear is to deter crime.   * We are going straight to the trade-off without deconstructing why the concept of deterrence actually never works.   + Point out that deterrence doesn’t work because most criminals don’t plan to be caught, this is good! Give me multiple lines of reasoning, e.g. criminals aren’t rational, crimes of passion don’t require forethought, etc. * We should frame criminals as also broader victims of society, e.g. impoverished communities committing crimes out of economic desperation. Tack on all of the other structural failures that lead to this cycle of discrimination.   Can we have a big picture comparison as to why rehabilitation is the ultimate goal of the justice system?   * Point out that reducing the crime rate is the higher goal behind things like deterrence, so Prop achieves this goal better via rehab.   + Especially for issues like victim’s rights, we need to explain that preventing even more people from becoming victims in the future is more aligned with the goal of the justice system, instead of fulfilling every retributive desire of every present victim. * Then explain the larger goals of delivering justice, and mistreating prisoners in a way that violates human rights also violates the principle goal of the justice system.   Can we look UP a bit more Isabella? Let’s have some eye contact with the judge!  Please offer more POIs!  5.19 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports the Scandinavian prison model |
| --- |

| 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:  I like the hook, it’s very catchy on criminals being made. Can we link it clearly to the motion on the role that prisons play in that equation in proliferating criminality?   * Good job signposting!   On the set-up:   * Well done structuring 4 key differences between the Scandinavian prison model vs alternative prison systems.   + But be mindful that you have to be quick and to the point because this is the set-up. It shouldn’t be argumentative. * On a more rehab-oriented prison model, we should illustrate what this looks like in practice! E.g. heavy investment in competent rehabilitation specialists, regular counseling and check-ups, etc. * We then added examples on how the living environment differs, such as the existence of privacy, well done!   + We also added examples on how wardens are trained differently in the Scandinavian prison model, good job! We don’t have to add so many examples here in the interest of time. * What is your burden/winning pathway?   Since we haven’t been able to get into our arguments in time, don’t take the second POI! It’s a short speech today. We only went into the argument with one minute left.  It’s isn’t clear we went into corporations and corruption, what exactly is the thesis of the argument?   * Rather than criticising the prison industrial complex, we should be defending the rehabilitation model first and explaining why it’s better. * We jumped straight into crime rates increasing post-prison time. * We need to explain what are the reasons behind why people commit crimes, and why your model is incredibly effective in fixing these reasons.   We should frame criminals as also broader victims of society, e.g. impoverished communities committing crimes out of economic desperation. Tack on all of the other structural failures that lead to this cycle of discrimination.  Can we have a big picture comparison as to why rehabilitation is the ultimate goal of the justice system?   * Point out that reducing the crime rate is the higher goal behind things like deterrence, so prop achieves this goal better via rehab.   Good job offering POIs!  5.20 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Karin Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports the Scandinavian prison model |
| --- |

| 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:  Well done with the rebuttal that a society that is willing to fund prison systems is tied to how effective the Scandinavian prison model is.   * Can we explain why the government intervening to fund this will kickstart a shift in societal culture, so that we are less likely to seek vengeance and more likely to seek an effective system?   Good rebuttal as well that we don’t just let everyone out of prison, but we need to add more clarity on what the system looks like!   * Point out that maximum security prisons exist, and those who are extremely dangerous are not eligible to walk out of prisons on a daily basis.   We need to rebut deterrence!   * We are going straight to the trade-off without deconstructing why the concept of deterrence actually never works.   + Point out that deterrence doesn’t work because most criminals don’t plan to be caught, this is good! Give me multiple lines of reasoning, e.g. criminals aren’t rational, crimes of passion don’t require forethought, etc.   Instead of just clarifying that your team offers mental health services, etc:   * Explain to the judge why the Opposition is not able to co-opt any of this!   + If the Opposition wants to fix this, then they lose their own principles of deterrence and retribution. * Point out what exactly are these underlying culprits behind the commission of crime, and how each of the mechs you’ve provided fixes this.   + E.g. There are criminals with aggressive and violent outbursts due to a traumatic upbringing, so mental health services directly target the root cause. * We are over-relying on the stats rather than giving me real mechanistic analysis as to why this outcome of effectiveness is likely.   We should frame criminals as also broader victims of society, e.g. impoverished communities committing crimes out of economic desperation. Tack on all of the other structural failures that lead to this cycle of discrimination.  Can we have a big picture comparison as to why rehabilitation is the ultimate goal of the justice system?   * Point out that reducing the crime rate is the higher goal behind things like deterrence, so Prop achieves this goal better via rehab. * Then explain the larger goals of delivering justice, and mistreating prisoners in a way that violates human rights also violates the principle goal of the justice system.   Please offer more POIs!  5.13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports the Scandinavian prison model |
| --- |

| 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 pushback that fear is a common denominator that criminals react to, but we need to be more nuanced in reacting to all the other underlying reasons behind crime being committed.   * How will fear be incorporated in instances of poverty or mental health issues contributing to the commission of crimes.   When rebutting rehabilitation, I need to hear what your counterfactual is in this debate!   * We need some strategic caveats on how to defend the failures of your conventional prison model!   + Can you suggest how we can integrate rehabilitation and education into your prison model without sacrificing the purpose of original prisons?     - E.g. Your conventional prisons can offer rehab, opportunities, etc without allowing them to leave and improving conditions to the level of dorms.   We are reinforcing retribution in a vacuum instead of actively adding value. We need to prove that society is owed some kind of moral compensation due to the crime being committed.   * Explain that every act of harm may traumatise everyone else and make them live in fear. Every criminal action also deteriorates our culture against criminal behaviour. * The impacting of this argument cannot only be grounded in theory, bring back the examples we discussed on society ostracising these criminals due to insufficient justice delivered.   + We then need to tie it back to how this then defeats Opp’s main goal of rehabilitation and reintegration.   Well done on reinforcing the importance of deterrence, but we’re not explaining why this cycle of criminality supercedes the one that Proposition has highlighted.   * We referenced first-time offenders in your POI, bring this group of people back into the debate on why deterrence is the only way to minimise the crimes of first instance!   When we are defending the rights of victims, we are arguing it theoretically.   * Why does any of this matter in the bigger picture of Prop arguing for a more effective criminal justice system?   + Explain why the biggest goal of the criminal justice system is actually in delivering justice, and deprioritising the victims is the biggest miscarriage of justice.     - We need a lot more rhetoric on the trauma that victims suffer when their perpetrators walk free.   We need a big picture weighing on what goals of punishment ought to be prioritised over the other, and deal with Prop’s claim that effectiveness trumps all.  Our speech structure is suffering today, work on organising either clashes, or clear rebuttals and arguments.  Good job offering POIs!  5.02 - Good timing! | | | | | | |