| **Student Name:** Preston Chung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Our opening is not contentious. Both sides probably agree that eating meat is not ethical. We should instead explain why shaming is the best mechanism for change.  Why are we repeating the motion?  Set-up   1. Aggressive shaming - good on protests and public messaging. Good on scale here. Why do they have an incentive to listen to protests, compared to speeches? 2. Good on explaining benefit - but still, why do they listen? 3. Good on burdens.   Argument 1   * Why do they give in? Can we analyse what the incentives of meat eaters are? Why do they eat meat, why do these incentives change when we shame them? * POI: this explains how there are harms; you need to explain why shame changes behaviour.   Argument 2   * Is this contentious in the debate? Or will Opp agree with this?   We need to explain how ignorance leads to these harms, and how shaming leads to public discourse about the ethical implications of meat consumption. The shocking nature of such tactics might force people to confront the reality of animal suffering in factory farms, which is often hidden from public view. This increased awareness could lead to a reconsideration of their dietary choices.  We need to ask POIs more consistently  Preston, I think we’re improving very quickly towards being able to move up! I’ll put in a recommendation for you to be moved up to PSD II from Unit 4 realistically.  04:22 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jay Lam |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians. |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Our opening needs to explain why this choice is legitimate, rather than just saying we must respect it.  Where is the counter-set-up? What strategy does your side pursue to make lives of animals better?  Rebuttal   * Why are we responding to the lack of moral regard for animals - we can accept this and instead say we cannot * Why does the animal rights movement feel this way? This entire debate is about the best way for them to achieve change.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim of this argument? * Why should this actor care about the choices of meat eaters, and respect them? Why is choice sacrosanct? * How does your side achieve change? We should explain how aggressive shaming is likely to alienate a significant portion of the population, including those who might otherwise be sympathetic to the cause of animal welfare. This approach can create defensiveness and resentment, making people less receptive to the movement's message.   Jay, we need to wise up and prep seriously so we don’t end up debating the motion without any consideration for the actor within the motion, especially where we spent the entire class talking about this.  03:43  We need to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alyssa Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians. |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Fair opening, but is this contentious? Does Opp say their lives matter less? We need to go on the attack and point out how they cannot simultaneously respect animal lives and respect meat eater’s choices.  Rebuttal   * We didn’t offer any responses to the claims on choice and the value of choice. This is easy to respond to - you can point out how this falls out of the debate given that this is an actor motion.   Argument 1   * The impact is well explained, but not mechanised. I don’t know why people change their minds. * We need to explain why people eat meat right now, and how their choices are altered when they are suddenly aggressively shamed. We need to explain how ignorance leads to these harms, and how shaming leads to public discourse about the ethical implications of meat consumption. The shocking nature of such tactics might force people to confront the reality of animal suffering in factory farms, which is often hidden from public view. This increased awareness could lead to a reconsideration of their dietary choices.   We cannot ask if we can just wrap up at 02:00 minutes! We have to speak a minimum of 4 minutes next time. It is also unacceptable for us to go on our phone whilst someone else is speaking. We need to be asking POIs.  02:50  **We’re speaking as if we’re reading out a pre-written speech; we need to adopt a more conversational tone!**  It’s our job to ask POIs, especially when we aren’t the person speaking immediately after, or have already spoken. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Verena Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians. |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Why should they not be shamed? Why would the animal rights movement think this way? Remember that this is an actor motion. Why do they prioritise freedom of choice over animal rights?  Rebuttal   * Our focus should not be on meat eating being legitimate, but rather that we should pursue empathy instead. Explain how aggressive shaming tactics can create a backlash effect, where people become more entrenched in their existing beliefs and behaviours out of defiance. This can ultimately hinder the progress of the animal rights movement. * Explain how lack of buy in undermines the benefits of Proposition; what is the implication of your response? * The counter-model needs to be unpacked in greater detail! What other strategies do we think are likely to work. Don’t just suggest these, but explain why they are likely to create change and work.   Argument 1   * Why do these counter-steps work? The mechanisation is missing. How do people actually change their behaviour?   It’s our job to ask POIs, especially when we aren’t the person speaking immediately after, or have already spoken. I appreciate that you ask them when reminded, but this reminder should not have to exist!  04:30 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yu Bo Peng |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians. |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Why is it effective? Why won’t they have a choice? Don’t they just get angry and irritated and unlikely to change their behaviour as a result?  Clash 1   * Why is it false? We just say it is, without explaining why. Explain how aggressive shaming tactics, while unpleasant, can be effective in grabbing attention and sparking public discourse about the ethical implications of meat consumption. The shocking nature of such tactics might force people to confront the reality of animal suffering in factory farms, which is often hidden from public view. This increased awareness could lead some individuals to reconsider their dietary choices. * Good on why choice doesn’t matter; explain how Opp cannot simultaneously respect animal lives and respect meat eater’s choices. Remind them that this is an actor motion, and hence their argument on choice doesn’t make sense!   Clash 2   * Why is it unlikely to work? Explain how people think and why empathy or choice is unlikely to change the way they think? Does it shock their system, or does it lead them to believe that it is okay to make the choice they do.   We’re speaking too slowly and at the same pace and tone throughout. We need to alter our tone, speed up, slow down, and use strategic pauses.  Good use of clashes!  Let’s ask POIs more consistently!  04:04 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lucas Ma |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians. |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Why does the animal rights movement care about the choice of people? How does respecting choice let them achieve their goals? Remember that this is an actor motion. Why do they prioritise freedom of choice over animal rights?  We claim to have clashes but largely just go speaker by speaker within them. How is this a clash structure? The clashes don’t have names, aren’t indicative of key issues in the debate. We need to change this up.  Rebuttal   * Our focus should not be on meat eating being legitimate, but rather that we should pursue empathy instead. Explain how aggressive shaming tactics can create a backlash effect, where people become more entrenched in their existing beliefs and behaviours out of defiance. This can ultimately hinder the progress of the animal rights movement. * Explain how lack of buy in undermines the benefits of Proposition; what is the implication of your response?   POI: you need to analyse why they currently eat meat, to be able to explain how they shift their mindset or belief system.  Our speech is pretty repetitive in terms of the responses we are making.  POI: Why do farmers matter more to the animal rights movement?    04:15  We didn’t ask a single POI today. We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Aiden Cheng |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Good opening - why is it the worst method? Explain how aggressive shaming tactics can create a backlash effect, where people become more entrenched in their existing beliefs and behaviours out of defiance. This can ultimately hinder the progress of the animal rights movement.  What are the names of these clashes? What are the deciding issues of the debate? We claim to have clashes but largely just go speaker by speaker within them. How is this a clash structure? The clashes don’t have names, and aren't indicative of key issues in the debate. We need to change this up.  Why does the animal rights movement care about the choice of people? How does respecting choice let them achieve their goals? Remember that this is an actor motion. Why do they prioritise freedom of choice over animal rights?  Our focus should not be on meat eating being legitimate, but rather that we should pursue empathy instead. Aggressive shaming is likely to alienate a significant portion of the population, including those who might otherwise be sympathetic to the cause of animal welfare. This approach can create defensiveness and resentment, making people less receptive to the movement's message.  Why does the animal rights movement care about the food chain, or care about the impact we make here?  Explain how lack of buy in undermines the benefits of Proposition; what is the implication of your response?  04:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chloe Lit |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house, as the animal rights movement, would aggressively shame non-vegetarians |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  **Note:** The speeches for today’s class are meant to be four minutes in length.  Our opening is very essay-like, but good in that it highlights how low stakes interventions do not alter behaviour. We need to pinpoint what the implication of this is response is; how does it impact their case.  The structure of a reply should be in clashes - so issues in the debate you win on, or reasons as to why you win. The clash can’t come out at 02:30; the entire speech should be 30 second opening, 1ish minute first clash, 1ish minute second clash, then conclusion.  Explain how aggressive shaming tactics, while unpleasant, can be effective in grabbing attention and sparking public discourse about the ethical implications of meat consumption. The shocking nature of such tactics might force people to confront the reality of animal suffering in factory farms, which is often hidden from public view. This increased awareness could lead some individuals to reconsider their dietary choices.  POI: why should the value of animal life only be measured in utility to humans?  Good on ego!  We’re reading for the vast majority of the speech, and hold our hands together as well. We need to work on making our delivery sound more natural. We have good ideas and are very sharp - we need to iron out the fundamentals and then we should be ready to move up!  We have to ask POIs.  03:51 | | | | | | |