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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Don’t read your opening - this is not a reading exercise!  Animals have rights - good; is the upshot that we need to be friendly towards them? Or that we need to make sure that they have humane treatment?  Set-up is missing entirely. What’s the model, how is this going to work, in which way will this occur? What are the interests of the movement?  Argument 1   * Why is humane treatment the best way forward? Opp will argue that yes, current treatment is wrong but the way forward must be to institute a ban. The extension of valuing their life is to ensure that value is sustained throughout. * Why will the animal advocacy group succeed? There’s no analysis as to how any of this actually happens.   Argument 2   * Why is humane treatment enough to meet the moral harm you’re talking about? * Good observation on a complete banning being difficult - why is this true? What is the analysis for this? Explain this properly! Many people support better treatment of animals, a complete ban on animal products can be polarising. Focusing on humane treatment can garner broader public support and build a stronger coalition for animal welfare. This wider support base can then be leveraged for future initiatives. * POI - explain why there is a lack of willingness!   04:38 - we need to spend more time thinking about what is contentious and how to analyse to prove our outcomes.  We need to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Prop probably agrees that a total ban is what is morally superior, but their contention is that it is impossible to achieve. Your opening needs to target this.  Set-up   * Fair on what this means. * You do a good job explaining how advocacy could work - but the explanation we give is still fairly vague. You need to give me a more detailed overview of these efforts, as we discussed in class prior!   Rebuttal   * We should pinpoint that the logical conclusion of humane treatment is a complete ban; if they think they deserve humane treatment by virtue of feeling pain and being sentient, then we shouldn’t even eat them! You need to say - their only qualm then is feasibility - I will now explain why we have feasibility. * While incremental improvements in treatment are important, the ultimate goal should be the abolition of animal exploitation. Prioritising humane treatment can distract from this long-term objective and delay its realisation.   Argument 1   * What are we talking about with regards to biodiversity? The argument is contingent on proving a ban actually occurs, and we never do this!   We need to argue that the term "humane" can be loosely defined and easily manipulated by industry. Producers may claim to follow humane practices while still engaging in practices that cause significant animal suffering. A ban provides a clearer, less ambiguous standard. We can also argue that focusing on humane treatment can normalise and perpetuate the use of animals for human consumption. It can create the illusion of ethical consumption, diverting attention from the fundamental issue of animal exploitation.  We need to take prep more seriously, and actually write things down so that we don’t end up having limited positive content when it comes to giving our speech.  04:10 - hit 5! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Good opening! Don’t repeat the motion in signposting. Point out how there is no analysis on why a ban actually materialises on Opp.  Rebuttal   * Good work saying you agree - but then don’t say it leads to lots of problems, point out how difficult it is to get a complete ban through. Problems is so incredibly vague! This is also the only response we give - we need to spend time analysing why what they said is wrong, both in the responses they make to our first speaker and to their own arguments.   Argument 1   * We seem to have forgotten the actor here; pinpoint how even though we are aware there is a perfect moral claim to the lives of these animals, this is not possible. Then go into analysing why the average person probably doesn’t care enough for a full ban to materialise. * ‘What if we give them’ - is this a statement or a question? Remember that you’re arguing that this needs to happen; ‘won’t this just change everyone’s perspective’ - will it? You’re meant to explain to me that it will! Our phrasing has to be argumentative, not explorative.   We’re just reading, and making no eye contact at all. You have to also use hand gestures, rather than digesting with your hands!  We need to ask POIs! I should not have to remind you before every Opp speech that you need to ask a POI.  04:26 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Prop agrees that a total ban is what is morally superior, but their contention is that it is impossible to achieve. Your opening needs to target this.  Rebuttal   * Protests - it does matter; why does our ban get passed? How does it get legalised? There is no analysis explaining how this occurs! Discuss the potential for legislative action to promote plant-based diets and restrict or ban animal agriculture. Use examples of existing policies that support animal welfare, such as bans on certain farming practices or subsidies for plant-based food production. Argue for the possibility of similar policies aimed at reducing and eventually eliminating animal consumption. * Good work pinpointing that the logical conclusion of humane treatment is a complete ban; if they think they deserve humane treatment by virtue of feeling pain and being sentient, then we shouldn’t even eat them! However, we need to go beyond and need to say - their only qualm then is feasibility - I will now explain why we have feasibility. * While incremental improvements in treatment are important, the ultimate goal should be the abolition of animal exploitation. Prioritising humane treatment can distract from this long-term objective and delay its realisation.   POI: this is a very important question, and we need to answer straight-away! We ‘could’ hold campaigns - will they work?  We need to argue that the term "humane" can be loosely defined and easily manipulated by industry. Producers may claim to follow humane practices while still engaging in practices that cause significant animal suffering. A ban provides a clearer, less ambiguous standard. We can also argue that focusing on humane treatment can normalise and perpetuate the use of animals for human consumption. It can create the illusion of ethical consumption, diverting attention from the fundamental issue of animal exploitation.  We didn’t have a second speaker argument!  We just read out our speech. We need to lower our paper, make eye contact and speak with more confidence.  04:32 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Opp agrees that this treatment is bad. They think that to the extent sentience exists, humane treatment is insufficient. You need to explain why this is not the case and that this is the only way to achieve the goals of the advocacy group.  Signposting needs to be more direct and to the point, and actually needs to have the **names** of clashes. What are your clashes? You say you have them, but I am not being told what the title is, what the thesis is, or what you will prove within it.  Rebuttal   * Humane treatment isn’t contentious in the debate. Explain why this is **enough** instead. See the POI Preston asks you. * Explain instead how an outright ban is impossible to implement and faces significant public resistance. Focusing on improving treatment standards is a more pragmatic approach that can achieve tangible results in the short term. These improvements can include better living conditions for farm animals, stricter regulations on animal testing, and cracking down on animal cruelty. * A complete ban on animal products is a polarising issue. Focusing on humane treatment can garner broader public support and build a stronger coalition for animal welfare. This wider support base can then be leveraged for future initiatives.   ‘Have you ever thought that’ - this is a competitive speech, not explorative. Drop this phrasing please!   * Explain how even if a ban were eventually achieved, it would take time to implement. Focusing on humane treatment addresses the immediate suffering of animals currently in the system. This direct action can significantly improve the lives of countless animals while working towards long-term goals.   We have to actually have clashes, with names, with titles, with a clear identification of the issues in the round.  Is there a reason why we aren’t asking POIs? We need to ask without being constantly reminded that this is something we have to do.  04:58 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house, as an animal advocacy group, would prioritise advocating for the humane treatment of animals instead of advocating for the ban on animal consumption |
| --- |

| 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 five minutes in length.  Good opening - point out the lack of contention from Proposition. They never explain why it is okay to engage in humane treatment but still eat animals. Rather than saying 3rd Prop’s arguments, and addressing the POI - use this as your opening instead to illustrate the lack of engagement.  Clash 1 - don’t say one of the biggest clashes, say ‘two clashes in this speech’ the first on morality, and whether humane treatment is enough.   * Good on incentives of farms. We need to argue that the term "humane" can be loosely defined and easily manipulated by industry. Producers may claim to follow humane practices while still engaging in practices that cause significant animal suffering. A ban provides a clearer, less ambiguous standard. * We can also argue that focusing on humane treatment can normalise and perpetuate the use of animals for human consumption. It can create the illusion of ethical consumption, diverting attention from the fundamental issue of animal exploitation.   Clash 2 - title? What will you prove here?   * Interest and incentive isn’t enough, explain capacity. Analyse why it is possible to have a complete ban. * The conclusion shouldn’t be that the argument is illogical - what is the point or purpose of saying this? The same applies to asking for statistics - this is a competitive debate speech… per the response in your third clash. The upshot of a clash should be why your side wins on the issue and hence wins the debate.   Clash 3 - title? What will you prove here?  Why does our ban get passed? How does it get legalised? There is no analysis explaining how this occurs! Discuss the potential for legislative action to promote plant-based diets and restrict or ban animal agriculture. Use examples of existing policies that support animal welfare, such as bans on certain farming practices or subsidies for plant-based food production. Argue for the possibility of similar policies aimed at reducing and eventually eliminating animal consumption.  The clashes seem more like a speaker by speaker rebuttal structure than actually being clashes!  What is the point of saying illogical, irrelevant and so on? Will the judge just believe you because you said it?  04:40 | | | | | | |