| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would eject national sports teams from international competitions if their fans or players are found to have committed racist or offensive acts during matches |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  The hook could have a stronger point of impact on the severity of the harms of athletes being verbally abused.   * Signpost your content into issues/clashes as the third speaker.   I appreciate that we’re washing out that there are other victims being abused as well in response to the rights of the ejected national team.   * But we need some kind of weighing mechanism here. Actively weigh why the rights of discriminated athletes at the receiving end of the abuse ought to outweigh the rights of other athletes, because they suffer the most.   + We then need characterisation on the degree of the offences here to understand the human costs.     - For example, fans giving racist slurs to even star athletes like Naomi Osaka, to the point of making sports a traumatic experience for her and making her consider an early retirement.     - There’s a vague harm on people self-hating and self-harming due to the verbal abuse? We need characterisation here, otherwise it sounds like we’re jumping to a radical outcome.   On sports no longer being inclusive and hurting fans, could we spend time proving what is actually the biggest role of international sports?   * Explain that international sports is about cultural exchange, and turning it an arena   We have to engage with Opp’s point that the policy is not even effective.   * Reinforce the incentives of fans and why they would be deterred. Can we specifically engage with Opp stating that they could still engage in these behaviours outside of the stadium and Prop isn’t dealing with the root of the problem?   + Frame that this reduces it on a large scale, and point out that the Opposition offers zero solutions toward this.   Instead of starting the first clash at 3:30 (in a 5 minutes’ speech!), integrate your rebuttals as layer in the clash itself.  The clash itself does not have any real comparison, just an asserted conclusion. There needs to be meat on the bones of these clashes.  Please offer more POIs!   * Good job offering one to 3rd Prop.   4.23 - We are really under-timed today! | | | | | | |