| **Student Name:** Jasper She |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 5 to 5.30 minutes’ long.]  After the hook, signpost your content into issues/clashes as the third speaker.  Interesting rebuttal about some countries don’t have strong diplomatic relations with others, but what if they did care about the other nation?   * The better response is to point out that Prop can never prove their argument because foreign policies are decided on a variety of complex metrics outside of just how another national team’s fans behaved.   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 what is in their hearts and minds.   * It’s unclear how the Opposition deals with the root of the problem as well, so provide me a counterfactual.   + Could we have a clear engagement with the Proposition’s incentive analysis on why their policy works? They had a clear analysis that fans have an incentive to avoid misbehaving in order to not harm their favourite team.   Good reinforcement 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?   On the second clash of ineffectiveness of the policy:   * 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. * 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 impacting that the behaviour continues outside of the stadium, but jumping towards fans being even more violent is a bit of a logical leap!   + It’s unclear how the Opposition deals with the root of the problem as well.   The last point attacking Prop’s modelling came a little too late!   * The difficulty in investigations is something that can be fixed through better processes.   Good job offering POIs!  5.45 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |