| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  I see we’re borrowing Bo Seo’s opening line here, I respect the attempt.   * But we’re still being quite assertive as to what is the true essence or goal of the Olympics! I would love some framing as to why competitiveness is more important than representation.   As the 3rd speaker, use the structure of issues/clashes to organise your responses.  When we’re calling out a concession, we need to spend more time explaining how that kills off their case.  On the purpose of sports, we’re calling out Opp’s lack of mechanisation but it’s far more intuitive to side with Opp on fairness because they’re the only ones allowing weaker sporting nations the ability to secure their sport! So we have to be comparative here.   * Why are we agreeing with the characterisation that weaker nations have a poor ability to develop their athletes? This is precisely why Opp argues that we need to secure their chance at attending the Olympics, so they have a chance at development. * Why is it okay to not allow them any opportunity to develop sports in their country?   + In the model, we should propose a mechanism so that these weaker countries can receive funding to develop their sports outside of the Olympics, and they can eventually still earn a spot in the future.   On creating more competitiveness, what is the value of this to sports?   * What effect will this have to the audience to see a stronger clash of higher-merit athletes?   + Will this be more inspiring? Will this lead to greater access? More sponsorship so the Olympics will be aired everywhere? * We’re claiming that the Olympics would be trash, but it isn’t clear that the Olympics is not competitive in the status quo!   On these athletes not even going very far in the rounds, this wasn’t the benefit argued by Opp. They are arguing that the recognition and support comes from simply being a national representative. So we have to engage with their best case scenario.  Try to organise all the clashes by themes and conclude accordingly.  Please offer more POIs today!  5.57 - We’re slightly under-timed! Wait for the double bell. | | | | | | |