| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  In order to prove the effectiveness of boycotts:   * You have to first explain the incentives of hosting nations. Explain clearly that the ultimate purpose of bidding for the right to host is to bring a large number of audience to their country, so a boycott will actively hurt the hosting nations.   + Having said that, we need to engage with Opp’s specific analysis on these nations being rich and regimes being broadly unresponsive to criticisms. * Now, our boycotts are being conflated to bigger things like protests, which has not been proposed by your first speaker. So spend time re-characterising what actions would fully constitute a boycott.   In response to the POI, we could’ve pointed out that if this debate is restricted to authoritarian nations, then Opp’s counterfactual of diplomacy would similarly fail.  Good job explaining that diplomatic pressure and communication can happen on top of a boycott!   * We should’ve actively called out the Opposition that they cannot even propose this countermodel, because it’s an actor debate! The sports fan would not have been able to pursue diplomacy as an alternative, we came so close to saying this out loud.   Analysing the importance of human rights in your argument is quite generic and not very contentious (considering Opp’s clarification that they also support it)! Try to analyse this in a way that is more contextualised to the motion itself.   * Actively clarify what kind of human rights are actively being violated by Qatar and Russia in the process of hosting the international sports event.   + Then explain to me why the Opposition cannot say that they also support human rights while simultaneously attending these events!     - These stadiums were built on the backs of the bones of labourers, their blood is on our hands if we are complicit in these abuses and attend these events that happen at the expense of their human rights.   Please offer more POIs!  7.26 | | | | | | |