| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 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.]  I appreciate the use of the analogy of holding the perpetrator vs the victim accountable to represent corporations as the culprit, and consumers are merely victims.   * Point out that the root cause of the climate crisis are the companies and hammer this down with real facts, e.g. 70% of all pollution is emitted by 100 companies.; whereas consumers lack affordable options around them. * Steph, don’t forget to signpost your speech.   On the set-up:   * Before saying that you will pressure the state, mention first that this is from the perspective of the green movement spending their capital on one strategy over the other. * Good job highlighting exactly the legal frameworks that companies are forced to comply with.   + I appreciate the use of Shell as the grounding. I still need you to tell me the severity of the penalties. How severe are the financial penalties? Are you willing to suspend their business license if they don’t comply?   + We should also include positive policies such as including tax benefits to enable companies to transition. Otherwise, we leave companies no choice but to resist compliance via other tactics such as lobbying.   On your first argument:   * Good start on the limits of consumer action versus corporate action.   + However, while the premise is true, why can’t consumers boycott companies to the extent where these companies end up adopting the same kind of changes in corporate policy?   + We need to first prove that consumers will not be able to influence corporations in any meaningful way, thus we have to resort to state regulations.     - Explain why consumers are selfish, prioritise affordability, convenience, etc.     - Explain that companies often engage in consumer manipulation, which allows them to get away with greenwashing. Explain precisely HOW they’re able to do this by funding expert media campaigns.       * Spend time characterising how damaging the tactic of greenwashing is! * Nice spot that being green is a privileged choice, but explain how so, i.e. why exactly are green choices expensive and inaccessible. * Then immediately contrast this with the fact that it is the companies who have the capacity to produce green products and make them affordable. So the change needs to be imposed by the state.   Why does culpability matter? Explain that making more responsible choices often comes at the expense of their own quality of life, this isn’t fair. Whereas companies have all the wealth they need to make the transition to a green system. So we must hurt companies, not consumers.   * We eventually mentioned that this hurts their own quality of life, well done!   Good response to the POI on the limitations of consumers in creating mass change.   * However, I need to know why the environmental movement is capable of convincing the government better than they can convince consumers.   + If these consumers are so limited in ability, would they be able to garner the kind of critical mass to pass your kind of changes?   Good characterisation on consumers being selfish, but bear in mind that the movement’s captive audience are probably environmentally-conscious consumers.   * Spend more time analysing why exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green, and this is why your case matters.   + Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts. * Compliance with regulations in your world cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open. So, things like lobbying will not be able to overcome this.   There was no environmental impacting throughout the speech! Focus on actually saving the environment in your final argument.  8.24 - Watch for time please! | | | | | | |