| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Excellent clarity that the Opposition does not condone human rights violations, immediately explain what would be an alternative way to advocate for rights without a boycott.   * Nice job explaining that we could engage the host nation as a way of dealing with this.   + But what does this actually look like? A petition? What power is your demand if you’re still supporting the event?     - We mentioned diplomacy later on in the set-up, be clear on what that diplomacy looks like!       * Next time, have the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.       * This motion is also an actor debate, how does a sports fan pursue diplomacy as an alternative? Are they pressuring their own governments to do this? Why will their government listen to them?   Good rebuttal on the ineffectiveness of boycotts.   * While the local societies don’t quite care about human rights violations, surely the reason why they’re hosting an international sporting event is to attract the masses to visit their country? We can’t simply assert that they won’t care at all, otherwise they wouldn’t have bid for it.   + Good characterisation that hosting nations are quite wealthy, and not financially hurt by this.   Actively call out the Proposition for arguing a lot of non-contentious material.  I appreciate the use of examples on boycotts not being the best solution, be careful to not use examples in place of analysis. Focus on WHY it doesn’t work, instead of just pointing out that it doesn’t.   * A lot of this material overlaps with your rebuttal as well. Which part is the value-add?   After explaining that boycotts do not align with the interests of a sports fan, actively outline what is the interest of a sports fan!   * They care about sports more than their labour laws. Why should they have to sacrifice their own passions and interests?   On using diplomacy as an alternative, we need to spend time explaining that host nations are actively trying to improve their image in the international scene, this is why they react positively to diplomacy.  It is unclear why national interest such as better trading partners is something that can be achieved by a sports fan alone! Is this something you can even offer on the table?  Please offer more POIs!   * Good job POI’ing 2nd Prop frequently!   7.35 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |