| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  I need a hook. What you think personally is not a hook! You need to point down why this makes the environment better/analyse why companies are at the root of the environmental crisis.  I enjoyed the hook! It would be even better if we included a more realistic depiction of the state’s lack of benevolence, rather than just the analogy in the rhetoric. Point out that the root cause of the climate crisis are the companies and hammer this down with real facts, e.g. 70% of all pollution is emitted by 100 companies.  Set-up   * There should never be five points of set-up! This is excessive, and also indicates that you are likely just arguing in set-up. * We start by analysing the incentives of customers - this is all needed in an argument, not your set-up. They’re also made out to be three different things, when all you are analysing is that customers are status oriented; the point to make is that they are convenience and ease oriented, such that they will not make the sacrifice needed to force companies to change their behaviour. * On legal responsibility - you most need to address this, but put it last in set-up. At the conclusion of your set-up, are fines the only mechanism as to how this works? Why is it likely that companies will comply?   + We should also include positive policies such as including tax benefits to enable companies to transition. Otherwise, we leave companies no choice but to resist compliance via other tactics.   We spent 3 minutes and 49 seconds on the above, which is far too much. Your first argument needs to start LATEST by 2 minutes.  Argument 1   * What is the thesis or central claim of this argument? * We’re skipping all analysis on the incentives of companies, and why they cannot escape legal accountability being pushed by the state. There is no process analysis of how their incentives or capacities change. * We need to spend more time establishing how exactly the legal system is not liable to abuse by these companies. To the extent you set them up as so powerful in their ability to throw their weight around, you need to establish why this will not occur on your side of the house through the legal manner. * You need to establish why consumer responsibility will fail - insert analysis of why consumers are likely selfish, why being green is a privileged choice - and that as a result, the alternative is expensive and inaccessible. * You need to establish why it is the companies who have the capacity to produce green products and make them affordable. So the change needs to be imposed by the state.   06:02 - We need to ask more POIs! A minimum of two to each speaker. Don’t just raise your hand - say POI! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  Why is this a debate about enforcement? Presumably, if enforcement was impossible, this debate could not happen. The point you need to make is on corporate capture and compliance.  Set-up   * Rather than ‘properly emphasising this’, you should call them out for a lack of explanation as to why legal responsibility is sufficient for flipping incentives, due to things like regulatory * Good work acknowledging that there is increasing awareness, but these aren’t distinct points of set-up. You need to establish why and how consciousness emerges, or has emerged, and especially in demographics that lead to change. You must evaluate which demographic we need to boycott or take action against these companies, and why this is likely to happen. * Each example is under-explained, where you assert consciousness leads to scandal leads to change. * It isn’t clear to me what consumers in your world do. We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve.   Rebuttal   * Same comment as above on enforcement and fiat applies. You are shadow-boxing! * On USP - doesn’t this go against you? If their USP is affordability, what incentive do they have to change, where this USP is what gets them consumers? * They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers.So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience by the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.   Argument 1   * The same question as above applies here; why do these consumers have these incentives, and in sufficient numbers to achieve change? * On whether consumers care, we’re explaining the rise of ethical consumerism from a business sense. We should be explaining that consumers are starting to care about being green in particular. Explain that environmental consciousness is on the rise thanks to global media. Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy. Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. * We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience.   Argument 2   * Legislation is susceptible to change the same way people’s opinions are. Is this an argument or an observation? If you want to run an argument on authority, run an argument about how difficult it is to convince politicians due to regulatory capture instead.   06:16 - when you slow down and enunciate, your style improves significantly. Do this more. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  Tell me why they escape accountability. Is it because consumers don’t care enough? Why is this the case?  Rebuttal   * On these locals - you can just say - exactly! These consumers cannot be trusted to make such decisions. The observation isn’t being connected to any upshot or implication - what does this do to their case or path to victory? * Why isn’t it known? Why won’t they research? Ryan’s set-up explains that there is a shift in environment - you have to engage with this. Why is ‘peer pressure’ insufficient in changing behaviour? What competing priorities do people have? * Why will companies comply with these regulations? The existence of regulations does not automatically lead to compliance. * Ethical existence doesn’t mean abuse doesn’t exist! Is this a realistic claim? * Why is person to person difference on social media a bad thing? Don’t rebut things for the sake of them! You have to analyse why companies have power to sway customers through greenwashing, or advertising. Explain why companies engage in abusive practices against consumers well, and why this doesn’t or can’t occur through this nebulous concept of legal responsibility.   Argument 1   * Good on incentives of companies here. * Lobbying and regulatory capture HURT your argument! It showcases that legal responsibility is easy for big companies to dodge! * On the government being able to enforce change:   + Spend more time analysing why exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green, and this is why your case matters. Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts.   + Compliance with regulations cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open. And things like lobbying will not be able to overcome this.   I need to know why the environmental movement is capable of convincing the government better than they can convince consumers.  06:12 - We need to ask more POIs! A minimum of two to each speaker. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  No one is disputing that there is a climate crisis. The focus needs to be on the failure of the state to flip companies into good behaviour; explain why profit is all these companies care about. I like the distant promises bit, but otherwise, the point you are trying to make is getting lost in the rhetoric.  Rebuttal   * Why do companies care about profit the most? We are too assertive here! What are their incentives? * On awareness - why is the Shein example being used as a substitute for analysis? The same applies to the trend of thrifting. You have to breakdown substantially why and how the environmental movement has become more prominent, due to an increase in natural disasters, global warming, and general dissemination of information. THEN provide examples. * On corporate lobbying and regulatory capture - you need to question why the state, or even the environmental movement has the ability to challenge these companies. We’re missing the whole point on why the state will not crack down on this golden egg!   + Give examples of powerful lobbyists that win against public interest and are able to make the government deregulate, e.g. big pharma, NRA, etc. * POI - too assertive on the incentives of consumers.   Argument 1 - this is not new.   * Good work acknowledging that there is increasing awareness, but you need to establish why and how consciousness emerges, or has emerged, and especially in demographics that lead to change. You must evaluate which demographic we need to boycott or take action against these companies, and why this is likely to happen. Each example is under-explained, where you assert consciousness leads to scandal leads to change. * Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy. Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience. * It isn’t clear to me what consumers in your world do. We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve.   They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers. So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience by the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.  06:04 - We need to ask more POIs! A minimum of two to each speaker. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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 is still being phrased excessively. We’re saying two things - that companies do not have incentives to be transparent, and that consumers have no incentive to care about this information. Make it clear what you are trying to say, and make the take-away clear. What do these incentives show? How does it hurt their path to victory?  Clash 1   * You need to analyse why even where information may exist, there is no explanation as to WHY people, and a sufficient number of people, will act upon this information. Don’t dispute that social media spreads information - which it does, but take their claim at its best. Then, explain why social media operates in echochambers, such that people who care do, but those who don’t don’t - this still isn’t the critical mass needed for these companies to behave in these ways. * Analyse why and how companies engage in greenwashing and advertising such that they are intentionally misleading consumers. You need to establish this as fact, rather than just saying companies spread misinformation. * The comparative is unclear. We need to spend more time establishing how exactly the legal system is not liable to abuse by these companies. To the extent you set them up as so powerful in their ability to throw their weight around, you need to establish why this will not occur on your side of the house through the legal manner.   Clash 2   * How are the responses different from the first clash? * We have to analyse WHY exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green. Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts. Compliance with regulations cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open. * We have to be comparative to what Opp is arguing. She argued that corporate lobbying will overcome a lot of the state incentives, so you cannot argue your reasons in a vacuum. You have to argue why your reasons are MORE powerful than corporate lobbying.   + E.g. Explain why voters will punish the government if they are being lied to. * We can add a moral angle here as well. Explain that making more responsible choices often comes at the expense of their own quality of life, this isn’t fair. Whereas companies have all the wealth they need to make the transition to a green system. So we must hurt companies, not consumers.   06:06 - We need to ask more POIs! A minimum of two to each speaker. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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:  Why aren’t they responsive, what is the contradiction? What is this opening achieving? If the point is that lobbying or regulatory capture exist, slow down and explain the implications of this on their case. You need to balance your speech out with some moments of aggression and speed, and other calmer and slower ones. It’s all just one tone and pace at the moment.  Clash 1   * Good questions on what legal responsibility is. Explain why the vagueness is bad. * Don’t fixate on enforcement and the ICJ. Focus on corporate capture instead. You need to question why the state, or even the environmental movement has the ability to challenge these companies. We’re missing the whole point on why the state will not crack down on this golden egg!   + Give examples of powerful lobbyists that win against public interest and are able to make the government deregulate, e.g. big pharma, NRA, etc. * Break down the Chevron example, and why they have so much power in this legal battle. We’re just asserting it at present. * What’s the comparative? Why does your side not fall to the massive power of these companies as you have established?   Clash 2   * Why is the information sufficient to make consumers prioritise ethics over convenience? Good work acknowledging that there is increasing awareness, but you need to establish why and how consciousness emerges, or has emerged, and especially in demographics that lead to change. You must evaluate which demographic we need to boycott or take action against these companies, and why this is likely to happen. Each example is under-explained, where you assert consciousness leads to scandal leads to change. * Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy. Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience. * It isn’t clear to me what consumers in your world do. We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve. * Good call-out on their lack of sufficient response beyond social media being bad.   They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers. So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience by the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.  05:57 - We need to ask more POIs! A minimum of two to each speaker. | | | | | | |