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

| **Motion:** This house regrets Batman’s no kill rule |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  We need to start with a high-impact hook, rather than diving right into the content.   * Even if you are confused on how to execute this, don’t voice out your inner monologue once the speech has started. Just push through!   Where are the rebuttals to the Opposition? She argued:   * Batman must be a moral figure because of his influence on children. * All criminals deserve a second chance for rehabilitation.   On protecting more lives overall, explain that this is a moral justification that can take down Isabella’s first argument!   * Point out that protecting more people from dying is the same moral justification for when we allow the death penalty, so death is an acceptable punishment. * But Batman is NOT an authorised state to inflict this level of violence.   + Point out that the public trusts Batman more than they trust Gotham police. Then characterise that Batman will use this power very judiciously, and not abuse it.     - If Opp allows Batman to be a vigilante anyways, it makes no difference that we are adding one additional potential punishment on the table.   Try to verbalise your structure during rebuttals and arguments, it isn’t clear what is being rebutted or when we have transitioned into our arguments.  On the majority of criminals being repeat offenders, we cannot analyse this in a vacuum.   * If the majority of the supervillains in the Batman series are psychopathic maniacs who don’t traditionally value their own lives, then why will Batman killing be an effective form of deterrence? * If this deterrence argument was solely about the average criminal, why are they not deterred already under the status quo?   + The Opposition argues that these criminals can still be arrested and incarcerated in their world.     - So expand the human costs by contextualising Gotham as a high-crime society, so the status quo is a failing one.   We need to defend Batman as an actor! Explain that this kill order will be reserved for the worst of the worst criminals who are actively risking society.   * These will not likely be criminals who can rehabilitate or deserve a second chance.   Both of the arguments have already been argued by your first speaker, so try to focus on where you can add value from your last speaker.  Please offer more POIs today!  6.57 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |