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

| **Motion**: This house believes that military conscription is illegitimate |
| --- |

| 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:  Have a more impactful hook, Torres!   * Good job signposting your speech.   Don’t just call out that they have no prove, you need to counter-analyse the premise.   * Even if Opp is cherry-picking a country that is facing security risks, Prop doesn’t have an example of a country using conscription but does not actually need.   + Engage with the Opp saying that many countries actually cannot access the military alternatives you highlighted.   + We are asserting that the world is in peace, but most countries who rely on conscription do face some kind of security risk!   We cannot just conclude that this is an illegitimate exercise of state authority because people did not consent. We need to engage with Opp claiming that the people NEED national security in order to survive.   * Aside from mentioning the potential costs, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well as highly IMPACTFUL   + What is even the cost of losing these two years of training compared to the loss of soldiers during a security risk?   + Opp has already argued that a few years of training does not hurt their life, so you have to be comparative in the debate. * Surely the state wouldn’t enlist a person or force them to continue service instead of discharging them if they do face any long-term harm. What options are available here.   We need to explain the moral impact of this argument of these people losing their individual choices!   * Point out that this is blood on the state’s hands, enslaving the lives of people who did not consent to risking their lives. * Use what we learn on whether the state has any authority to force this level of sacrifice.   There is no real engagement with Opp’s point on national security.   * We need to double down on military conscription being a death sentence and analyse the human costs here. * Otherwise, your speech is repetitive of Chester’s and not engaging in the actual debate element today.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  3.10 - We are severely under-timed! Please try to reach 5 minutes. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that military conscription is illegitimate |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Come up with a hook, Chester, instead of just repeating the motion.   * Signpost before the set-up as well.   On the case set-up:   * Good job defining military conscription. * We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * Try to provide some alternatives on how to make joining the military a more attractive, voluntary option via more benefits to soldiers, and celebrating soldiers.   + You can also focus on investing resources in force multipliers, such as using technology to substitute for the number of soldiers.   + These alternatives are important to address Opp’s main justification on strengthening the military in a time of crisis.   On the first argument:   * Merely explaining the opportunity costs to the conscripts is not enough, because you have to compare it to the opportunity cost of weakening the military. * Aside from mentioning the potential costs, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well as highly IMPACTFUL   + What is even the cost of losing these two years of training compared to the loss of soldiers during a security risk? * Surely the state wouldn’t enlist a person or force them to continue service instead of discharging them if they do face any long-term harm. What options are available here.   We need to explain the moral impact of this argument of these people losing their individual choices!   * Point out that this is blood on the state’s hands, enslaving the lives of people who did not consent to risking their lives. * Use what we learn on whether the state has any authority to force this level of sacrifice.   On the second argument:   * We are asserting that the world is in peace, but most countries who rely on conscription do face some kind of security risk! * Good point that forcing people to fight leads to low morale.   + But the comparison is having NO people to fight, then what is the difference in outcome? If you want to protect national security as well, then surely Opp is winning this comparative.   Don’t take the POI right away, wait to finish your sentence.   * We are finally explaining alternatives which are encouraging people to join the military, well done! Be sure to put this in the set-up next time.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.55 - So close to 5 minutes! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tiffany Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that military conscription is illegitimate |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  You keep saying ‘Opposition’ when you really mean ‘Proposition,’ good call-out but fully conclude your claim that national security is the most important thing in the debate and only Opposition delivers this.  On the counter set-up:   * Well done on the clarity of who is eligible for conscription, and we are not forcing those who are less physically able.   + We can also differentiate them according to abilities and suitability, so not everyone is sent to the frontlines. * When we point out that only certain countries resort to conscription, point out that all of them are facing security risks.   + Explain that most conscripts are only ever in training and they are not actually sent to war. So a lot of Prop’s harms do not come to fruition. * We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’   Excellent rebuttal on a lot of conscripts still have a significant time to enjoy their youth and pursue the future they wanted.   * We can also point out that military training can be an ASSET, since they can serve as a launching pad for their future careers. Their skill sets also benefit from this experience. * More strategically, weigh this opportunity cost to the one suffered by national security.   But we still needed a rebuttal to address all of the individual harms to soldiers if they do get sent to war. Mitigate the harms they suffer from. Point out that the state doesn’t conscript soldiers with the intention of them dying, it’s for them to survive.  On your argument:   * Good job focusing on the important of national security.   + Explain the balance of human costs and point out why national security is a gateway right in which everyone else’s right to life is contingent on.   + We need to explain precisely what these dire national security risks are. We cannot assert that everyone else will simply die without proving it!     - Good use of South Korea as an example, but tell me what is happening in South Korea!     - Why can’t the state explore the military alternatives that Proposition highlighted?       * Explain that if the state lacks resources, we cannot afford to offer these great benefits to increase voluntary enrollment.   Try to also include analysis on the reciprocal relationship between the state and civilians and why it’s the civilian’s obligation to do this.  Well done offering POIs today!  4.55 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |