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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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.  Can showcase or will showcase; remember that you’re telling me this is true and needs to occur. Your phrasing is not indicative of this. Is it that it can raise public awareness, or that this is the **only way to raise public awareness**.  We made little to no eye contact in the first minute of our speech!  Set-up   * Link to the factory farming discussion we had last class. * Counter-model? You’re Prop, you model, Opposition provides a counter-model. * We repeated our model twice; you should define graphic suffering and then just model the implementation.   Argument 1   * Is this part of the motion contentious? Will the Opposition disagree with this analysis on factory farming and how it is morally wrong? * Our focus needs to be on why people consume this kind of meat, and why we do not take action in the status quo. * Fair on information being available. Draw a clear distinction between words/information and graphic images - what changes here that actually elicits a response from people? * POI: point out how there isn’t desensitisation; people don’t know factory farming occurs, or that it occurs in the ways it does. * We need to analyse how graphic images evoke strong negative emotions like disgust, sadness, and empathy. These emotions can directly motivate avoidance as disgust can create a visceral aversion to meat. Empathy for animals can strengthen the motivation to avoid contributing to their suffering.   We have to vary our tone and pace!  05:06  You have to ask more than just ONE POI! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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.  What is this opening? You build up Prop and then say ‘however’. Do we think this shift is the high impact hook to make our landing in the debate? Our opening should address the biggest gap in the debate, which is 1st Prop’s response to Aiden’s POI.  Don’t do rebuttal first, do set-up first. We need to know what the comparative is prior to responses.  Rebuttal   * Don’t just say they didn’t explain. They did in some capacity highlight the distinction between words and graphic images. Either explain how desensitisation occurs, or how this leads to cognitive dissonance. You’re not actually responding.   POI - why do people behave in the way they do? Why are benefits of vegetarianism the tipping point to change? Is this realistic?  Argument 1   * Why will it not resonate with them? You just assert this. * What is ‘not a really good reaction’ to this? * Our language is vague, and doesn’t explore any mechanism as to having adverse or positive reactions either way. * We need to analyse how, to protect themselves from distressing imagery and uncomfortable emotions, consumers might just actively avoid looking at the packaging or shopping in areas where meat is displayed. Or that repeated exposure to graphic images can lead to emotional blunting and reduced impact over time. We can also argue that they will engage in biased information processing to justify continued meat consumption (e.g., by minimizing the suffering of animals or emphasizing the benefits of meat). * What did we prove at the end of this argument?   We’re just reading out our speech! We have little to no eye contact, and use no hand gestures. We have to depend less on written notes and try to establish a flow in our speech. Don’t use essay-like connector words like ‘however’ and ‘furthermore’ and ‘therefore’ - try to speak more conversationally.  04:40  We have to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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.  We need to not just repeat that this creates a sense of horror, but target what 1st Opp has said. You need to directly challenge their counter-model and explain why it doesn’t work from the get-go.  Rebuttal   * Call them out on a lack of explanation as to how the benefits of vegetarianism lead to change. * Reiterate and rebuild 1st Prop’s arguments against the responses from 1st Opp. * Our focus needs to be on why people consume this kind of meat, and why we do not take action in the status quo. * We need to analyse how graphic images evoke strong negative emotions like disgust, sadness, and empathy. These emotions can directly motivate avoidance as disgust can create a visceral aversion to meat. Empathy for animals can strengthen the motivation to avoid contributing to their suffering.   Argument 1   * This is the impact of this motion; we want to explain how this pressure is unique and exclusive to your side. * It is also contingent on proving the motion is what forces people to care about animal welfare and factory farming. Have we proven this? * We need to explain what the distinction between words/information and graphic images is - what changes here that actually elicits a response from people? * What is the impact of this argument?   03:57 - you have to hit 5.  We need to ask POIs consistently. You cannot wait for your speech to end to ask POIs. You also need to word your POIs clearly so you don’t waste the speaker’s time. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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.  What is this opening? I appreciate the effort to have a high impact hook but this isn’t very clear. Our opening should address the biggest gap in the debate, which is the concept of desensitisation.  Rebuttal   * Don’t call things irrelevant. You should point out this outcome is entirely contingent on proving that change actually occurs; which they don’t actually prove. * We barely responded. We’re not responding to any of the big arguments coming from 1st Prop.   POI - why doesn’t the same happen with words/your counter-model? Why is desensitisation only applicable to Prop?  Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim of this argument? * What did we prove that is new at the end of this argument?   We need to analyse how, to protect themselves from distressing imagery and uncomfortable emotions, consumers might just actively avoid looking at the packaging or shopping in areas where meat is displayed. Or that repeated exposure to graphic images can lead to emotional blunting and reduced impact over time. We can also argue that they will engage in biased information processing to justify continued meat consumption (e.g., by minimizing the suffering of animals or emphasizing the benefits of meat).  We’re just reading out our speech! We have little to no eye contact, and use no hand gestures. We have to depend less on written notes and try to establish a flow in our speech. Don’t use essay-like connector words like ‘however’ and ‘furthermore’ and ‘therefore’ - try to speak more conversationally.  03:27  Ask more than just ONE POI! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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 wash desensitisation. Explain how instead how people are desensitised to what Opp has - which is words and language; you have visual imagery. Explain the delineation between these two. It matters less if desensitisation occurs in the long run, as long as your side is able to get the change that they need.  Do we have just one clash?  Clash 1: Consumption   * Fair on people throwing them away; explain why they have no incentive to listen. Call them out on a lack of explanation as to how the benefits of vegetarianism lead to change. * Our focus needs to be on why people consume this kind of meat, and why we do not take action in the status quo. * We need to analyse how graphic images evoke strong negative emotions like disgust, sadness, and empathy. These emotions can directly motivate avoidance as disgust can create a visceral aversion to meat. Empathy for animals can strengthen the motivation to avoid contributing to their suffering.   POI: point out how this breaks the debate; clear response.  POI: children - explain how the younger they are the easier it is to make a lifestyle adjustment; we aren’t scaring them, we’re just presenting them with the truth.  We should have TWO clashes, rather than just one.  05:04 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would require meat packaging to include graphic images of animal suffering |
| --- |

| 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.  Why do we care about the average consumer more than the welfare of animals? We discussed prior to the debate how the outcomes that both sides want to achieve is animal welfare. This is a debate about which side achieves this through the mechanism of graphic suffering… You’re also using a rhetorical question to start your speech - which we’ve discussed at length is not the way to be opening your speech.  Where are your clashes? Speaker by speaker rebuttal is not what we should be doing at this point.  Rebuttal   * Is this debate about those animals that aren't suffering? Are they even part of the debate? * You’re making up stuff that Prop said! Chloe asks this POI as well. They never mentioned TED talks at all; in fact it’s 1st Opp who discusses this.   You cannot add on to your teammates' arguments as 3rd. This is against the rules. You can rebuild through responding, but it is against the rules to extend.  Children - the nutrition from meat is replaceable.  We need to analyse how, to protect themselves from distressing imagery and uncomfortable emotions, consumers might just actively avoid looking at the packaging or shopping in areas where meat is displayed. Or that repeated exposure to graphic images can lead to emotional blunting and reduced impact over time. We can also argue that they will engage in biased information processing to justify continued meat consumption (e.g., by minimizing the suffering of animals or emphasizing the benefits of meat).  We’re just reading out our speech! We have little to no eye contact, and use no hand gestures. We have to depend less on written notes and try to establish a flow in our speech.  **Alyssa, I’m quite confused by the structure and approach in this speech; it demonstrates you weren’t tracking or listening properly, and that you’re not applying the structure of third that we’ve gone over a fair few times. Please pay more attention and apply yourself properly in class.**  We can’t wait till the last minute to ask a POI, especially one that basically contradicts the entire stance the motion assigns to us. You have to be focused on POIs from the moment the debate starts.  04:29 | | | | | | |