| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  I want a stronger opening! If you want to highlight the problem with the status quo, do this with more urgency; for instance how if we don’t do this, it boosts the reputation of a country, or allows for further harms to continue etc.  Set-up   * What is the framing from Prop for this debate? * Fair on violations and the kind that may exist. Good use of examples in motion to illustrate this. * What are the interests of these sports fans? What do they want?   Why do these HRV happen? Why do these countries bid to host these sporting events?  Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * Don’t make it sound like a thought experiment; these have happened. All of Russia doesn’t hate gay people, but the Russian state, rather is homophobic. The judges of these events are not Russian people; Shawn’s POI points this out as well. You can talk about the general environment of the country, but this isn’t the analysis you are presenting initially. * How does this boycott change the environment, or lead to change? The path forward is not clear in terms of how your side deals with this. * I’m unsure if the strongest push; in terms of active harm - would they go in the first place? What would the scale of a boycott be here?   The point we need to make is that these countries bid to increase tourism and to boost their reputation - when a boycott happens this goes away/they get punished for their HRV.  We need to dive deeper into the incentives of a sports fan, what their interests are and so forth - this is an actor motion!  04:42 - why aren’t we hitting five? | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening needs to be clearer. What is the point we are trying to make? Is it about missing out? We speak in a really muffled and quiet manner - we need to project more. We are capable of doing this, but need to push ourselves to be able to do so.  Set-up   * Do we need to counter define..? You don’t get to choose what kind of HRVs this debate is about! You have to argue within the realm of the motion, which includes all of the above. * What would you rather fans do?   Rebuttal   * What regulations? Is it true the situation isn’t that bad now? Bernard’s POI asks you this, but we have no response here. * What is the sports fan missing out? What are these lots of things?   Argument 1   * Do these regulations work? What are examples of these? * Why is it important for a sports fan? Why is it more important than what Prop says? * What is the impact of this argument?   We’re reading out what we have written. We need to make eye contact and deliver a speech! Parts of your speech are very difficult to track because of how softly you are speaking!  04:13 - why aren’t we able to hit 5?  Explain how high the barrier to entry to boycotting is for a sports fan; especially if the impact is minimal/sports fans are not political actors. They don’t get to choose which country the event will be hosted in.  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  I want a strong opening - why are sports fans aware of this/it ruins their viewing experience? I think we want to spell out how rather than there being an incentive to boycott, why it is the only moral action that can be taken in this scenario.  Rebuttal   * On the situation - good call out; also ask what these mysterious regulations are, how they are enforced and how it works. You should also attack their model/contour-definition of HRV. * Importance of event - challenge this directly!   Argument 1   * What would the scale of a boycott be here; consider instead how these HRV occurred not necessarily to the fans, but to others - so the workers who built the stadiums in Qatar, or even closer to your argument - LGBT+ community in Russia. * The point we need to make is that these countries bid to increase tourism and to boost their reputation - when a boycott happens this goes away/they get punished for their HRV. * Fair harm on safety. Good on the incentives of sports people, especially through the example of Qatar. However, these HRV weren’t against fans - they were against migrant workers. Does your argument still hold in this situation.   We’re reading out what we have written. We need to make eye contact and deliver a speech! Parts of your speech are very difficult to track because of how softly you are speaking!  04:10 - we need to be able to hit 5.  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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:  This mistake call out is too vague. Call it out with more specificity and clarity.  Rebuttal   * Good on medals; this is not about athletes and their performance. * Ask if corruption changes on either side! * Good call out on HRV being internal, as opposed to foreigners. * We need to stop and explain what the implications of our responses are.   Argument 1   * Why are we extending; you can use this analysis to rebuild your first speaker’s arguments within rebuttal. * Good work exploring the incentives of sports fans. * Good on deterrence effect; but do any of these regulations work? Is this is a realistic response?   We need to explain how HRV get better on our side - is it that boycotts don’t work because they can’t scale? Is it because we need people to show up and SEE for themselves?  Explain how high the barrier to entry to boycotting is for a sports fan; especially if the impact is minimal/sports fans are not political actors. They don’t get to choose which country the event will be hosted in.  Good POI to Bernard.  05:10 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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:  Is entertainment the governing preference of sports fans? I think we want to spell out how rather than there being an incentive to boycott, why it is the only moral action that can be taken in this scenario.  We shouldn't have such extensive analysis before clashes; all of this should be integrated within it. Otherwise, you will just sound repetitive!  Rebuttal   * They still allow participation; you’re incorrect. Fair on beds and how this doesn’t matter. * How does this boycott change the environment, or lead to change? The path forward is not clear in terms of how your side deals with this.   Actor analysis:   * Safety, entertainment etc.; are the sports fans the ones at risk? Shawn points out how internal groups to the country are the ones being subject rather than not. This is analysis that should be integrated into the first part of the first clash.   Clash 1   * Why are they hosted in less hostile environments? How does this change occur? * Lots of people went to Qatar and went to Russia; what does this prove? * The point we need to make is that these countries bid to increase tourism and to boost their reputation - when a boycott happens this goes away/they get punished for their HRV.   Cleaner structure today; but we still have to focus on making the clash the main focus or means of response!  05:02 | | | | | | |