| **Student Name:** Shawn Ho Chit Nip |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Don’t start your speech with imagine - you are putting the purpose of imagination on the judge; describe this instead; you do this anyways, but instead of describing what happens, explain the harm of this instead. We know what this debate is about - we don’t know what this debate is about from Proposition specifically.  Signposting was slightly extensive; try and get to set-up within the first 45 seconds of the speech.  Set-up (took more than 1 minute - should ideally take maximum 1 minute)   * Clear explanation of who this applies to and where. We need to explain why present policies aren’t enough - such as yellow or red flags. * On groups of fans - why is this justified? I don’t disagree, but you’re asserting that this is the way in which this occurs, as opposed to explaining why this is reasonable. * Framing:   + Sportsmanship; this should have been the opening instead. Use the opening to do double-duty on this.   Argument 1 (started at 3:00, which is too late)   * Represent countries; symbolic meaning - fair explanation; is there a lack of this in the status quo? You need to build up the problem/lack of present regulation to be able to justify a NEED to do this. Theoretical sportsmanship is insufficient, problem characterization needed. * Don’t get punished in SQ - why? Why is there leniency or a gap at present? You’re comparing your model to a very vague comparative. Push a comparative for Opp to have to defend. * You let them know - but do you change their behaviour? Why will this lead to them reflecting or thinking about this, beyond regulating for the sake of it? * Why is the last part of the speech how the model solves this? The mechanisation should come within the middle of the argument. * Do you think you prove your outcome by the end?   Your conclusion should not be you just listing what you did; give me a meaningful conclusion to your speech!  ‘Does the speaker not realise’ - don’t say this. Instead just go directly ‘this doesn’t account for xyz’. Not an MUN!  06:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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:  Good call-out on what they haven’t proven; focus on this instead of the more noisy and overcomplicated way of saying this. Openings should be simple and easy to understand, rather than saying this is harsh, there are negative consequences and that they have to deal with these.  **Signposting needs to come immediately after our opening.** We have to have a more disciplined approach to structure within our speech.  Rebuttal   * Start by summarising the 2-3 things you will respond to, and then go through them systematically as opposed to the bit by bit responses. * Not about performance - did they make it about performance? What is the implication of this clarification? * ‘Our model can deter this’ - what is your model? You went into rebuttal without explaining what this is, without any clarity on the comparative. **Set-up comes before rebuttal - as I have remarked in your feedback sheet before!**   Set-up   * Smart counter-model. Why is this uniquely distinct from Prop? Explain this properly. * POI - fair enough on preferences of fans. Analyse what the incentives of this person are, and how they change/get held accountable. This is what we talked about; unpack this in far greater detail. This comes out in greater detail in the POI you ask Lilianna.   Argument 1 (started at 03:50 - TOO LATE)   * Premise? What will you prove here? * Good use of examples! * Don’t get to play; establish the problem-solution gap/harm of missing out at the top of the argument, rather than building towards it.   We should have had two arguments, the first on why your side is able to prevent harm, the second on why you make sports better/keep good sports. Currently it’s a bit messy as one argument that isn’t being fully reasoned out.  **Our ideas and issue identification are very PSD III, but the discipline and refinement in your speeches is still a gap - we need to work on this before we can move up. Ask me if you have any questions about this.**  Don’t ask ‘can you elaborate’ style POIs - try and use the lack of clarity to blow up a hole instead.  06:24 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lilianna Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why is it not enough? Good opening in terms of identifying what you need to respond to straight away - which is their counter-model, but we need to explain WHY this is true as well.  Rebuttal   * Start by summarising the 2-3 things you will respond to, and then go through them systematically as opposed to the bit by bit responses. * Extend to everyone - why? Analyse what the incentives of this person are, and how they change/get held accountable. This is what we talked about; unpack this in far greater detail. * POI - what is the difference between multiple versus what Opp says. Explain why this high bar or burden is necessary. * Did we engage with the value of sports/enjoyment part of the argument 1st Opp runs?   Argument 1   * Premise? * What is new about this argument? I don’t want an extension, I want a NEW argument. * Good work characterising what a fan cares about. Go beyond just here to watch/love sports teams; why is their intuition or inclination to be racist/aggressive not more important? Why does it matter more? The justification as to why this matters the most is missing. * We also need to explain why present policies aren’t enough - such as yellow or red flags. Why is there leniency or a gap at present? You’re comparing your model to a very vague comparative. Push a comparative for Opp to have to defend. * You let them know - but do you change their behaviour? Why will this lead to them reflecting or thinking about this, beyond regulating for the sake of it?   Our style is better today in that our voice is louder. I need you to now look at the audience and engage with them whilst speaking! Hand gestures and an open body language as well.  We need to ask POIs! We didn’t ask a single POI in this debate.  05:39 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why is it ridiculous? Why does it make no impact? This needs to be stated up front. Quite a high burden of proof in that racism = good for competition. This needs to be very carefully reasoned out.  Rebuttal   * Start by summarising the 2-3 things you will respond to, and then go through them systematically as opposed to the bit by bit responses. * Mindset of not winning - is this true? Why is this true? Why do they think or behave in this way? * Why are you providing a solution **later** in your speech, if it is a response to something **now**? * Why does the mindset not change? Why does this motivation continue? Why do they care about attention compared to the effort they put in? See the POI Shawn asks. Once again - ‘later’ - why? * On the mindset and being racist - doesn’t this go against your own logic above about them seeking attention? This is contradictory? * Good attempt at flipping.   Argument 1   * Is this meaningfully different from the first speaker? What is new about this argument? I don’t want an extension, I want a NEW argument. * I’m uncertain as to the chain of logic in this argument; why are they frustrated, why are they angry - and why is this exclusive to your side? This comes out at the end in terms of being angry at the racists and getting to beat them. * Why does the fan matter more than the athlete - you have implicit weighing that suggests this in your speech.   We have to ask POIs. We didn’t ask a single POI in this debate.  05:45 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: THW 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:  Good opening but tell me how + why this doesn’t work in the status quo. Explain what the gap in the system is that they don’t take into account.  **Rebuttal - try to minimise extraneous rebuttal as much as possible. You have to use clashes instead. In signposting, you need to give me the NAMES of the clashes.** The present extraneous rebuttal you have could **easily** be fit into the clashes you have.   * Toxic - explain why so bad and so unresolvable. * Good on spirit and environment; what is the implication of this argument? Can everyone just channel their upset into being better players? Or is this an assumption/very convenient? * On individuals versus teams - explain this value judgement or calculus. Why do they think this way and why is this true? * Why is stress good stress - don’t just call them out, punish them for it.   Clash 1: Deterrence   * What will you prove in this issue? * Incentivized to help teams/pressure. Good. * Good example of Suarez. * Radical - good for the team. Why is this true? Rationalise these preferences for me in full, rather than asserting why this is true.   Clash 2: Fairness (5:28!!)   * What will you prove in this issue? * Explain why leniency in SQ means the fairest way is this. You assert fairness rather than explaining it.   **Our ideas and issue identification are very PSD III, but the discipline and refinement in your speeches is still a gap - we need to work on this before we can move up. Ask me if you have any questions about this.**  06:05 | | | | | | |