| **Student Name:** Anastasia Kavvathas |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Come up with a hook, instead of reading the motion for the debate.  As the 1st Opposition speaker, you don’t need to redefine if the definition is clear from the 1st Proposition speaker.   * Nor was there any necessity to define fans, it makes little to no difference in this debate as this isn’t contentious.   + What would be useful is to clarify what is the degree of offence required in order to disqualify the national team! Would they be ejected for trivial insults? * What is the Opposition’s alternative to controlling this specific problem?   In the rebuttals, we should engage with:   * The fans making sports an exclusive and harmful climate, * The fans being deterred from repeating these offences.   Good argument on this punishment being unfair to the athletes themselves.   * How do I weigh the rights of these athletes against other athletes who are being abused by the fans of the other side? * Just because fans do not mean the verbal abuse they are committing, does this somehow take away from the severity of the offence?   When we are describing the difficulty in controlling the behaviour of fans, this means that the Opposition will also have no viable pathway to fixing this problem.   * Then why can’t Prop offer this incentive so that fans will self-regulate?   The argument on policy failure directly overlaps with a lot of the material you’ve already argued.   * Saying that some people do not change their minds is missing Prop’s problem statement which is to protect athletes from verbal harassment, no one has the goal of curing their prejudices. * Interesting impact point that the behaviour continues outside of the stadium, but jumping towards targeting the families of athletes is a little bizarre! * It’s unclear how the Opposition deals with the root of the problem as well.   Please offer more POIs!  5.28 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |