| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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:  I want a strong opening - us repeating the motion achieves nothing! We want to highlight what the problem with the status quo is; for instance how this boosts the reputation of a country, or allows for further harms to continue etc.  Set-up   * Fair on recent violations, fair on how this boycott occurs. * Not able to bid - are we banning them, or we saying that this is a natural occurrence in that the incentive to bid whilst being such a country goes away because the boycott hurts this.   Argument 1   * Clear thesis, clear layers of analysis. Good job! * I’m unsure if the strongest push; in terms of active harm - would they go in the first place? What would the scale of a boycott be here; consider instead how these HRV occurred not necessarily to the fans, but to others - so the workers who built the stadiums in Qatar, or even closer to your argument - LGBT+ community in Russia. * Explain why the boycott means safety occurs - why does peace occur? This is definitely a jump that we need to build towards step by step.   Argument 2   * Thesis and layers of analysis flagging missing here! * Isn’t representation an impact of safety? Is this dependent on our first argument? * Good explanation of why safety matters. * Why is representation exclusive?   The point we need to make is that these countries bid to increase tourism and to boost their reputation - when a boycott happens this goes away/they get punished for their HRV.  We need to dive deeper into the incentives of a sports fan, what their interests are and so forth - this is an actor motion!  Good tone, we need to work on our argument identification + building up to impacts. How does this boycott convince countries to change their behaviours, or even alter them? The incentive analysis is missing!  05:26 - we could’ve extended our analysis to hit 6 with ease! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house, as a sports fan, would boycott international sporting events held in countries with documented and severe human rights violations (for example, the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar, or the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia). |
| --- |

| 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:  Good on effectiveness - give me the biggest reason as to why this is true; is it because this won’t scale? Is it because we need people to show up and SEE for themselves?  Signposting missing.  Counter set-up BEFORE rebuttal. What is this education? Why will they be educated? What does education change that is not yet present?  Rebuttal   * Fair call out - what is the implication here; does Prop achieve their impacts if this is true? * POI - explain how high the barrier to entry to boycotting is for a sports fan; especially if the impact is minimal/sports fan are not political actors. They don’t get to choose which country the event will be hosted in. * When pointing out gaps in analysis, explain what this gap means for their burden/path to victory in the debate.   Argument 1   * What does it mean to support the local population - this is pretty vague! * Good attempt at characterising the kind of country/landscape we are looking at. * Explain how this change occurs; what do these sporting events change? Why are we acknowledging it is a source of power and way to justify abuse!! * We need to weigh the impact on the locals versus impact on the country - and minimise impact on the country so as to respond to the safety push from Renee. * We do eventually cover the basics of the comments above, but do it in such a roundabout way! We need to focus on direct, clear analysis.   Argument 2   * Ineffective. Is this a positive reason not to boycott, or a negative reason - so technically rebuttal? * Show of strength acknowledgement undermines you again! * Why are they ineffective? What is the comparative? We are just reiterating the benefits of our first argument here. * What other alternatives or lack thereof exist for the local population?   We should have asked Renee a POI!  07:03 | | | | | | |