| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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 minutes’ long.]  When you say that the debate is confusing, we have to explain how this impacts the debate, and then explain clearly why the Opposition uniquely solves all of the confusion.  Why is it that we agreed with this policy that this means we do not care about our citizens?   * We could also be beneficiaries of this policy because that means opposing teams’ fans also cannot abuse our national team athletes. * On both sides, national interest could be harmed, why can’t the state control the behaviour of their own citizens and prevent them from committing offences?   Saying that some people do not change their prejudices 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.   I enjoyed the attempt to characterise the grey area on what constitutes a clear enough offence to warrant ejection.   * However, we’re ending a little too early here, Prop can still clarify their model and propose clear standards to this process.   + We need to explain why in most cases, these decisions will be made unfairly or arbitrarily.   Interesting rebuttal that some fans are completely uncontrollable. But this then means that a lot of athletes will continue to be subjected to verbal harassment in Opp's world.  If we added a longer conclusion, we would’ve hit 5 minutes!  Good job offering POIs today!  4.50 - So close! | | | | | | |