| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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.]  Good summation in the hook, but we’re better off prioritising impact rather than clarity at the top of our speech.  On the set-up:   * Good characterisation on the state of the economic structure of developing nations, in terms of lack of capacity and human labour capacity; it would be better if you started off explaining what the right to pollute first instead of diving in-depth to the economic specialisation of these nations!   + A lot of this are quite argumentative as well, re: colonisation, we’re better off expounding this in the argument later on. * Try not to reference your set-up as your “model,” since we’re planning to set this up as a value debate to lower your burden and set a strategic winning pathway!   + Well done characterising the right to pollute as a more viable economic development pathway that will also eventually participate in the green transition.   + Explain that these nations ought to be exempt from any international punishment and retaliation when they pursue economic development.   + Good job emphasising that developed nations have to bear the burden of the green transition, and engage in things like technology sharing. * All of the analysis on the incentives of developing countries to make the green transition in the future should all be in the argument instead!   + Good reasoning, I like the analysis on commercialisation improving affordability down the line. * Don’t forget to lower your burden towards proving that the right exists, rather than proving who is most proximate to a climate solution!   Work on time management, we shouldn’t move into argument only at the 4th minute.  On the first argument:   * Good job explaining why the green transition is economically burdensome, but we moved too fast into the strategic weighing on why development precedes environmental protection.   + What are the human costs of abandoning economic development? Explain how many lives are at stake in a way that is more urgent than the future environmental collapse. * We need more mechanistic analysis why these developing nations only have comparative advantage in the manufacturing industry, thus will have little to no alternative economic plan.   + If Opp showcases ANY viable alternatives, then all of your harms no longer materialise. * We need to be more comparative and explain why there is still time for these developing nations to catch up to the green transition after taking their time to accumulate their wealth first.   On the second argument:   * Well done characterising the role played by developed nations in contributing to the climate crisis.   + We should expand and explain that the majority of polluting companies are actually companies belonging to developed nations, who simply establish their supply chains abroad and pollute in developing nations. * After expounding on colonialism and the role that played in trapping the economy of developing nations, we can relate this back to justifying reparations, and why developed nations ought to shoulder the present burden of the green transition. * While I appreciate the obligation of the state angle, it isn’t comparative to the state obligation to prevent complete environmental disaster either. Why does one outweigh the other?   8.00 | | | | | | |