| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that developing countries have a "right to pollute" the environment |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  Rather than start with “no team will solve the climate crisis,” we should’ve started with stating that the Opposition actually comes closest to any kind of approximate solution. Instead, it sounded like you were de-emphasising your own winning pathway.   * Again, characterising why it’s so difficult to ever come close to stopping the climate crisis doesn’t help your case!   + We should be stating that these things ARE possible, but could only work if EVERY nation participated in the global green transition.   On the counter set-up:   * The characterisation of the climate crisis here seems floating, we should be attaching it to the premise of an urgent climate deadline that requires collective effort. * We need some kind of mechs highlighted from the status quo to help these vulnerable countries transition to green tech when it’s so expensive..   + We mentioned this in the first rebuttal, bring it up!   + After highlighting the Paris Agreement, etc, explain the political and economic capital to make these transitions CHEAPER. * Try to offer economic development alternatives as well since they have to disavow manufacturing.   On the right to pollute making things worse, it’s not just about adding time on the urgent timeline, it’s also about geographical proximity.   * Even if developed nations are helping out elsewhere, if they are polluting their own oceans, of course the ocean ecosystems will die out in that area. So these developing countries themselves have to practise restraint to protect their own livelihoods.   We needed to engage the moral justification by Prop on colonialism and exploitation by developed nations, as well as the human costs of the loss of economic development.  On your first argument:   * Good job characterising the looming climate apocalypse!   + Rather than just say more people die faster, explain the comparison of human costs, because Prop also argued the scale of people dying on their side.     - On your side, point out that the deaths are ad infinitum versus Prop’s losses are temporary in nature.       * Then use moral weighing to explain which group does the state owe a greater obligation to. * While I understand the logical reasoning on hurting livelihoods and jobs, how does this compare to the loss of manufacturing jobs being argued by Prop?   + Say you can minimise job losses because the green market also contributes to job creation.   The analysis on more political capital when large countries also provide green tech to them, is there a reason why Prop cannot even co-opt any of this? They also want the same!   * We have to burden push that Prop needs to oppose the climate treaties that Opp wanted.   + This should be a brand new 2nd argument altogether.   Please offer more POIs today!  8.19 | | | | | | |