| **Student Name:** Bea |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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:   * Nice hook; to be fair though, we don’t need to imagine a world without terrorism - we already live in a world with it! * Make sure that you have your sales person mode on when you’re speaking; the judge and your opponents can’t see fear or hesitation in your tone! * I think you need to make sure that you do the set-up first; so for example, when you are banning these ransoms, how will it be banned? How would you defend the ban? How would you punish people who break the ban? * You have good arguments but they are not being expanded on. For example, the first argument you had was about finances and preventing further terrorism. What needs to happen now, is you need to give me three distinct reasons for why the argument is true. Once you have your distinct reasons, you want to go ahead and explain each reason individually like this;   + **Why?** Keep asking yourself why a claim is true till you get about 3-4 good mini reasons.   + **How?** Keep asking yourself how your claim is going to happen till you get about 3-4 mini reasons. * Try to make sure that you are using some emotional contrasts and or different tones throughout your speech; the speech was a little monotonous! * What might the impact of this inequality between the rich and poor look like in the context of ransoms? Do terrorists really end up kidnapping the poor anyway? * Tell me more details about how this messes up counter-terrorism; is it because we get faulty intelligence, etc? How does that work?   Speaking time: 07:42.02, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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:   * Nice hook and good outrage! Good usage of a tone of horror. * Good signposting! * Rebuttals   + Lesser evil - Good call out for how Opp doesn’t deal with the terrorists gaining more money and power! Make sure you impact this more - this means that I didn’t actually respond!   + The negotiations and special forces - I think you can actually flip this against the opp. You can say that we usually don’t need to negotiate - our special forces are special for a reason; they are able to breach quickly and effectively as that’s what they are trained for. You can also say that this advantage also applies to terrorists; meaning that they get a lot more time to barricade themselves, etc.   + INTERPOL and anti-money laundering; You can say that actually, a lot of countries benefit from money laundering. This is because this is still a ton of money that is moving through your country's banking system - which you can profit from! Look at the case of HSBC in the UK and the Cartels for evidence.   1st: Hostage die   * I like that you are acknowledging that this isn’t the best situation! * You could actually use a utilitarian basis to judge the debate; which is that if a hostage dies because of no ransom, that is still preferable to the terrorists gaining more money and power and using that to do this same harm onto more people. * I like the explanation about how the terrorists become more emboldened; but, try to make sure that you are reasonable! I don’t think the government will give up completely on preventing hostage taking in the opp. * Good work on explaining how much better the military is at attacking the other side. You could also say that cutting funds off from this group is a good thing - because that means they don’t have money to recruit and train their recruits!   Speaking time: 08: | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Davian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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:   * Good start to the speech! Very good emotion and tone. Good hand gestures! * I think it might be good to start immediately with why the rescue missions you were talking about would be effective and good for people. This is because this is the main thing that’s keeping your case alive and it also really hurts my case! * Stakeholder analysis; terrorism - wants to make money; Government wants to rescue; good build up here for why this causes the opposite problem! * Try to tell me why terrorists will likely give up; it’s because if a government refuses to pay, it means that they are basically holding onto some random civilian that they need to care for and gain nothing for, but at the same time, this terrorist organisation now gets the full attention of the armed forces and the government. * I like this step by step approach that you’ve taken; good job! Keep it up please. (E.g., how does this cause the worst terrorism? How does this cause terrorism to get worse?) * That POI was a trap; you can just say it's because we ban them!! * For the clash analysis; make sure that you are framing why your argumentation is super effective to begin with! Then, make sure that you are explaining why your issues (or your angle or framing of the issue) is the most important! * The moral angle of the debate came a bit too late; it’s too new to be credited! Make sure to pass it to your partners next time.   Speaking time: 08:00.53, good work! | | | | | | |