| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THBT multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  Good focal point on polluting being an inherent wrong, but the principle wrong angle is definitely far less impactful than the protection of the environment angle.   * Good signposting.   On the set-up:   * We should clarify first what these environmental frameworks and regulations even are, rather than providing analysis on why these frameworks are stronger.   + Will this shut down the factories altogether, or is there a way to reconcile these industries with environmental laws? * Well done mechanising the enforcement pathways for greater collaboration.   + The best one is removing the ability to access the market in their home nation.   + The punishments should be proposed first, and then we propose collaborative tax subsidies for buy-in. * All of the analysis on why this reduces cost in the long-term and improving reliance should be in the argument instead of the set-up! * On creating more change, make sure we clarify that you don’t have to solve the climate crisis, it’s just which team is more proximate.   We are entering the argument quite late at past 04:00!  On the first argument:   * Good job characterising why the economies are structured in such a way that it enables highly-polluting industries.   + However, all of these analyses can be flipped by the Opposition to explain precisely why you will get no compliance!     - If they comply with you, they then sacrifice the livelihoods of their people and development for their own economy. * Well done mechanising and concluding as to why these developing nations will never regulate the environment on their own. We are better off focusing on the positive comparative as to why this intervention is absolutely necessary for the environment.   + Can we explain why we cannot afford to WAIT for LEDCs to develop first and then commit to the green transition? * We are highlighting mechanisms such as international scrutiny, without actually explaining WHY it’s that effective. Do developing countries even care enough about these things in comparison to unfettered economic development? A comparative analysis is better off! * The impact cannot just rely on the intuition that protecting the environment is good!   + We have to explain why it’s important enough to justify the violation of sovereignty and the hurting of the livelihood of others!   Time management, there was only 10 seconds to elaborate on the 2nd argument.  On the second argument:   * On the harms perpetuated by these companies, this is analysis to support why their own government owed them the duty to intervene. It’s not necessarily a defense of this specific motion.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.15 | | | | | | |