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

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening; we should say this is equivalent to negotiating with terrorists, or giving them legitimacy. We are funding terrorism, and we think this cannot occur.  Where is signposting?  Set-up   * Good work characterising the incentives of terrorist organisations! We should use examples here to illustrate the ways in which they operate. * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware.   The transition between set-up and our first argument is super messy!  Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What is the title? Even though we are engaging in the steps we’ve been taught, the lack of clear transition-marking is leading to this being a super messy argument! * We need to start by explaining the outcome we prioritise - which is that we need to disempower these organisations, and empower good decision making. In order to do this, we must ban this payment. * After this, we need to characterise why we are okay with this data being lost, or these citizens dying. We should explain how paying ransoms directly funds terrorist operations. This money can be used to purchase weapons, recruit members, plan attacks, and spread propaganda. Essentially, paying ransoms strengthens the organization and enables further acts of terror. We should also explain that paying ransoms creates a perverse incentive for more kidnappings and hostage-taking. It signals to terrorist groups that kidnapping is a profitable enterprise, encouraging them to target more individuals and potentially escalating the violence. This puts more people at risk. We should transition into the element of victims of circumstance here, explaining how terrorist groups may execute hostages even after receiving payment, or they may take more hostages to replace the released ones.   We need to pay more attention to flow and clarity, to ensure there is fluency and smoothness to our delivery.  04:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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:  Don’t describe that this happens, explain why we cannot abandon them. Explain that these are the victims of circumstance - and the state has a moral obligation to rescue them. The moral push of this needs to be clearer, and more efficiently worded.  Set-up   * Explain how payment would occur in your world, or how we would ensure checks and balances to ensure people or data are properly protected, and why terrorist organisations are unlikely to end up in a slippery slope - where they feel empowered to continue this further.   We spent two minutes on our opening and set-up. We have to be more word efficient!  Rebuttal   * We need to question whether they are willing to sacrifice these people! If ransom payments are outlawed, what other options are available to secure the release of hostages? Military interventions are often risky and can endanger the hostages further. Negotiations without the possibility of ransom can be ineffective.   Argument 1   * Good work identifying what rights are being sacrificed here. Explain why compared to alternatives, this is the only way forward where we don’t sacrifice these lives. * On the gateway - good! Explain how this means people cannot engage in a number of actions if we limit this for instance, using their own money for what they want; if a family or company is willing to pay a ransom to save a loved one, it should be their prerogative. * We can also analogise this to the state being okay with sacrificing people in the name of national security. * Explain how people or even data, end up in these situations because the government failed them in the first place!   04:34  We need to spend more time focusing on our style and delivery - sounding as engaged and clear as possible. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  We had a strong tonal start. Good opening!  Clear signposting.  Set-up   * Clear explanation of how this would work. We should also spend time characterising the incentives of terrorist organisations; upon payment, will they release these individuals or data? We should explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware.   Argument 1   * Clear thesis and headlining. Good explanation of the outcome your side is trying to pursue. * We should highlight that we need to disempower these organisations, and empower good decision making. In order to do this, we must ban this payment. * Good on how this empowers the terrorists. We need to go into a little bit more detail here - we should explain how paying ransoms directly funds terrorist operations. This money can be used to purchase weapons, recruit members, plan attacks, and spread propaganda. Essentially, paying ransoms strengthens the organization and enables further acts of terror. * Are these families making consensual and rational decisions? * Good on national security being important/valuable. * We should also explain that paying ransoms creates a perverse incentive for more kidnappings and hostage-taking. It signals to terrorist groups that kidnapping is a profitable enterprise, encouraging them to target more individuals and potentially escalating the violence. This puts more people at risk. We should transition into the element of victims of circumstance here, explaining how terrorist groups may execute hostages even after receiving payment, or they may take more hostages to replace the released ones.   This is a clear, well constructed principle argument. Well done!  03:47  Don’t just ask an elaboration POI, but the point of your response and question needs to be clear. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying of ransoms to terrorist organisations |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 work targeting the outcome of national security. What are these other ways? Why do the incentives of terrorist groups not go away? We should engage with this and put it to rest up top.  Set-up needs to come first! Explain how payment would occur in your world, or how we would ensure checks and balances to ensure people or data are properly protected, and why terrorist organisations are unlikely to end up in a slippery slope - where they feel empowered to continue this further.  Rebuttal   * On more extreme ways - we don’t add analysis from our opening, so this just ends up sounding repetitive. * We need to question whether they are willing to sacrifice these people! If ransom payments are outlawed, what other options are available to secure the release of hostages? Military interventions are often risky and can endanger the hostages further. Negotiations without the possibility of ransom can be ineffective.   Argument 1   * Good work clearly establishing the principle up top. This is done confidently and clearly. * Good on what each individual in this situation would want - they would choose safety and security. * Explain how people or even data, end up in these situations because the government failed them in the first place! * Explain why we cannot abandon them. Explain that these are the victims of circumstance - and the state has a moral obligation to rescue them. The moral push of this needs to be clearer, and more efficiently worded. * On the gateway - good! Explain how this means people cannot engage in a number of actions if we limit this for instance, using their own money for what they want; if a family or company is willing to pay a ransom to save a loved one, it should be their prerogative. * We can also analogise this to the state being okay with sacrificing people in the name of national security. * Good on moral tone, but the impact here is very abstract and not being grounded. We should try and break the signalling effect into realistic impacts.   04:23 | | | | | | |