| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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:  Our opening was quite fragmented and rocky today; good identification of the root versus symptoms - but this comes out in a not so persuasive manner. Let’s work on our flow! Good emphasis on this being the only way - explain why this is true up top, rather than repeating this in different ways.  The signposting should be numbered, rather than just descriptive.  Set-up   * Monitoring - say this quickly and then move on! You’re eating up your time here. * Good use of examples of what offensive is or may be. Why do these happen frequently/infrequently? * We need to explain why present policies aren’t enough - such as yellow or red flags.   Argument 1   * Thesis? * Why do they think this way? We assert they do without exploring their incentives, choices, ability to alter behaviour, past trends and so on! Why do they feel guilty? Is their passion for the team more important than their inclinations to be offensive? Can we analyse why racism or offensive behaviour even occurs in the first place? * 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. * What is the gap in status quo? What is the symptomatic approach on Opp and why is it insufficient? You’re comparing your model to a very vague comparative. Push a comparative for Opp to have to defend. * What is the impact of this argument?   Argument 2   * Thesis? * This is analysis that should be part of the first argument, as opposed to its own. You also started it at 4:30, which is too late to start a new argument! * Do you change their behaviour? Why will this lead to them reflecting or thinking about this, beyond regulating for the sake of it?   05:13  We’re speaking too slowly - let’s try and build up speed!  Let’s make sure we give POIs consistently and clearly.  Better structure today. Good! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Clear opening, the value statement needs to be justified.  Set-up   * Framing? * Good on warnings + bans. Fair on players - you basically support the status quo. Why is this sufficient?   Rebuttal   * What is fair and just? These are subjective concepts and claims. You need to tell me what is fair or just before asserting this isn’t. Why isn’t it? You never explain this. * Did we respond enough? We have to engage with the argument on guilt, changing behaviour, and so forth. We aren’t challenging the solvency of Prop’s approach at all.   Argument 1   * Repetition of rebuttal. * On pay - why is such a financial harm so significant? * Fair on collective punishment. * What is the comparative? How is your side better? Analyse what the incentives of this person are, and how they change/get held accountable on your side. * Why does the athlete’s career matter more than the victim of the offensive act/racism? This justification is also missing.   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.  04:30 - we need to work on our analysis. What did we prove within this speech?  Let’s make sure we give POIs consistently and clearly. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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:  Excellent offensive opening on the gaps and vagueness in Opp’s case. Immediately transition after this into signposting rather than just jumping to rebuttals. This leads to a messier speech as opposed to a cleaner one.  Good work weighing the harm over the career up top!  Rebuttal   * Good on the significance of harm. This was missing in 1st Prop and you’re filling this gap now. Don’t then say - ah but my extension will do this. Don’t build it up and then leave resolution for later. * Good explanation of why and how this weighs on both actors. Explain the competing preferences that exist, and why guilt becomes the tipping point; you’re right, but you need to explain this in greater detail. * Explain WHY offensive or racist acts occur in the first place. We need to explain why it occurs to explain how or why it will stop when the motion kicks in. Why do they feel guilty? Is their passion for the team more important than their inclinations to be offensive? * Good on spillover + long-term impacts of this policy.   Argument   * Good claim establishing up top. * On mob mentality - why are these specific acts/speech acts so likely to spread. * Excellent on the heat of matches + tension likely to exist. This is a great argument, but we need to unpack it a little bit more systematically - start by establishing how this happens/why this happens - impact this has - how you prevent it - why this matters.   Good identification of responses. I want you to have a cleaner approach to responses, as well as more systematic analysis, and then you’ll be ready to move up. Well done - let’s aim to do this within a month!  05:09 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hon Sum Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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:  This is an out of nowhere opening - has this been a big issue in the debate? Or is it a completely new point? What purpose does it serve in the debate bringing it up top?  Rebuttal   * Explain why this is sufficient; people break rules all the time. You aren’t analysing this in great enough detail as to individual behaviours + willing to take it, due to the heat of the match environment Sarah describes. You’re being so dismissive! * Why would they engage in sabotage? This isn’t in the spirit of the motion - why can’t we catch them? Why would this happen in such a convoluted manner? Don’t try to break the motion! * What are the harsher or more serious consequences? Don’t just drop it with no further explanation. * POI - sabotage is not a silver bullet response! * Don’t question if this doesn't happen - your side has already acknowledged this problem exists… you are contradicting them.   Argument 1   * In what way is this different from the argument Kayley makes in her speech? This is not new. * 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 does the athlete’s career matter more than the victim of the offensive act/racism? This justification is also missing.   05:07  We need to ask POIs. This is egregious! We cannot not ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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:  Opening needs to be more direct at poking holes in the speech right before you!  On sabotage - address this up top and explain why this isn’t a part of the debate; ways to find this out - the same cameras etc. Opp relies on, breaking the motion.  Signposting needs to include the TITLE of the clash.  Clash 1 - what is the name? What will you prove here?   * Start by systematically establishing what is said from them on this issue, why they are wrong - then explain what the comparative is, rebuilding against their responses. Then explain why you win it. You are speeding through summarising the exchange, as opposed to doing this so substantively. * Explain the lack of solvency here, and why their model doesn’t work - walk me through the incentives and decision making of fans and players - and then explain this properly, don’t just recite this!   Clash 2 - what is the name? What will you prove here?   * Same issue as above applies here. * What is the scale of harm we need to prevent? * Explain why leniency in SQ means the fairest way is this. You assert fairness rather than explaining it. * Justify the weighing Sarah uses in her speech.   Why is our conclusion nearly a minute long?  04:30 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lorelyn Schroeder |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Clear opening. Good work signposting titles, but don’t get into what is in it at all. Keep this short and concise.  Clash 1 - clear title.   * Why do you have to say what you’ll do first, rather than just getting into it; Prop tells us three things, or the crux of their contribution here is xyz. Then explain why this isn’t true at all. We go to explain the harm of this, rather than disproving the truth claim. * On upset - why does this matter more than the harm to the victim of the crime? Sarah says this and Hon Sum doesn’t respond. You need to engage with this. * Don’t take a POI in the middle of a sentence! * How do we change their behaviour? You assert SQ is sufficient - explain why this is true. Why is individual action, even if it is fairer, being targeted going to lead to change. * Good work spending time explaining why you win the clash?   Clash 2   * Why are we spending so much time playing the blame game on confusion etc.? * This is part of what you went into earlier. Why do they change their behaviour? It isn’t that they didn’t engage with this, it’s that this is the extent of analysis from Opp. * Explain how they only get anger and backlash. * 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? * Clash unfinished due to repetition/the fluff as mentioned above.   Time management!  Good use of clashes today!  We need to ASK POIs!  05:33 | | | | | | |