| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  Solid opening, good analogy to illustrate the absurdity of the claim being made on the other side.  Rebuttal   * I think we want to challenge three things; their context, and then their two arguments. Spell this out up front to ensure your rebuttal is clearly structured. * Good on how this is the responsibility of the state, and why they are deserving of legal punishment. You can argue that environmental harm constitutes a crime, on the basis of how we establish what a crime is; action and intent. * Good work establishing how you safeguard consumers from other incentives that are valuable and justified. Fair too on reinforcing how your first speaker established.   + You must evaluate which demographic we need to boycott or take action against these companies, and why this is unlikely to happen; is this the elite, or is this the middle and working class. * POI - on other countries - presumably the global status quo changes. If it doesn’t, or there are sufficient reasons presented as to why it doesn’t and provides this opt out, that needs to be engaged with - on both sides!   Did we have a second speaker argument? If we did, this was impossible to detect in terms of the transition.  I think we do a good job of establishing why companies are able to mislead consumers very clearly; we only assert the comparative following this. We need to spend more time establishing how exactly the legal system is not liable to abuse by these companies. To the extent you set them up as so powerful in their ability to throw their weight around, you need to establish why this will not occur on your side of the house through the legal manner.   * + How do the lawsuits emerge? What mechanisms of the legal system do we use? Who does this? Why is there buy-in? Where is the state most likely to get involved and crack down?   06:34 - we spoke 30 seconds under-time! | | | | | | |