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

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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:  We want to focus on the specificity of the problem - which is lax environmental standards; this is what brings MNCs to these countries (alongside cheap labour costs), and leads to the harms you claim. Good link to collective action later down the line - bring this up first!  ‘A bunch of set-up’.  Set-up   * Good work characterising them; don’t just label them as selfish - use examples to illustrate how there is no self-regulation or adherence; they moved their factories to these countries for this very purpose. * Good identification of the power asymmetry between MNCs and local government; explain how as a consequence, we must oblige them externally - even if local governments set laws, they will find ways out of it, like tax breaks for employment numbers etc. * Excellent on why MNCs still stay - make sure you spell out this means you co-opt the economic benefit here! The justification is that the overall cost of production is still cheap. * Don’t just drop the feasibility line! You need to give me some insight into how regulations occur; maybe linked to the revenue/fines etc.   Argument 1   * Good work spelling out the kind of companies this debate is about; don’t then jump to weighing up economics and LDC development; the structure/chronology of analysis here is confusing. * What is the central thesis of this argument? I’m still confused. * The point to make is that developing nations often lack the resources and regulatory capacity to effectively enforce environmental regulations.   + This creates a "race to the bottom" effect, where MNCs relocate to countries with weaker standards to reduce costs, leading to increased pollution and environmental damage.   + The developing nation isn’t scrutinous because they want to attract development, and hence cannot enforce regulations independent of this standard being implemented. * On development, explain that sustainable development actually requires balancing economic growth with environmental protection.   + This can only happen on your side, because by enforcing higher environmental standards, MNCs are incentivized to invest in cleaner technologies and sustainable practices, fostering a greener development trajectory.   Why is this an exclusive fix? You want to make sure you consider what Opp is likely to run to make your argument comparative; they are likely going to focus on the merits of development to accept this harm, and then talk about climate advocacy at a later timeline; the urgency of the problem hence must be emphasised on your side.  05:30 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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:  It’s just a false dichotomy, you can drop ‘fallacy’. The opening is a good identification of the stance on your side. You must address the development happens in LDCs anyways push from Prop re the overall cost of production still being cheaper.  Framing   * Any characterisation here doesn’t engage with their analysis of the cheapness persists despite environmental standards. * The analysis we have here is good, true and deep, but what is the purpose of it? Without attaching it to your stance, or strategic path to victory, I’m just sitting through a lecture on the key words in the motion.   Is it a pre-emption? You are 1st Opp. You are a responsive speaker.  Model   * What makes this different from Prop? We want to push that the cost of production does dip enough that either they leave, or they move towards automation etc. such that we need to get them to stay. * We need to spell out what meaningful restrictions we put, what freedoms we allow them to have - such that we can co-opt all economic benefits, but do it more sustainably.   Rebuttal - started at 3:44 - too late!  Argument 1   * Are we forbidding them from developing? Why does development stop on Proposition’s side? * We can also focus on cost; cost increases significantly on Proposition’s side in terms of products, even if they still stay in LDCs; what is their willingness to engage with other laws like labour protections if they have lost cost cutting in this way?   + If MNCs face significantly higher costs due to environmental regulations, they may be less willing to invest in other important areas, such as labor protections, fair wages, and community development programs.   + Ask what is more important, a climate restriction, or one that helps workers be treated better.   06:25  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Clarisse Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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:  I want a more specific, targeted opening - your side established why this isn’t a debate where Prop has to trade off economic development for the LDCs; they never engaged with this. This means their entire case is not comparative. Your clarification question dump is fine, but doesn’t get to the heart of the matter.  Rebuttal   * Is the solar panel MNC example compatible with other characterisations of them in your case? The element of them being compelled is fine; the point to make is that under regulations, they have to make these transitions - this is valuable because it means they have to bring in important green technology - which otherwise this country could not access. * POI - bring your 1st speaker’s case back! Giving three independent responses where neither hit on the key issue isn’t better than one which hits it. * Don’t just drop the feasibility line! You need to give me some insight into how regulations occur; maybe linked to the revenue/fines etc. You can then point out the power asymmetry between MNCs and local governments; explain how as a consequence, we must oblige them externally - even if local governments set laws, they will find ways out of it, like tax breaks for employment numbers etc.   + This creates a "race to the bottom" effect, where MNCs relocate to countries with weaker standards to reduce costs, leading to increased pollution and environmental damage.   Argument 1   * Excellent on the principle push of who suffers the most. The impact only comes at the end - the focus of the argument must be how this creates a double standard and perpetuates global inequalities. * People in developing countries are disproportionately affected by environmental damage, despite contributing less to global pollution. * Explain why this is true as well; why did they have to let this happen to them - because they need the economic development, which they were denied and deprived of due to colonialism.   Argument 2 - you sped through this in 30 seconds. Don’t do that!   * On development, explain that sustainable development actually requires balancing economic growth with environmental protection.   + This can only happen on your side, because by enforcing higher environmental standards, MNCs are incentivized to invest in cleaner technologies and sustainable practices, fostering a greener development trajectory.   06:15  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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:  ‘They harm developing nations people as a whole and developing nations’ - this is, indeed, the debate.  Slow down during signposting! I could barely catch what the structure of this speech was going to be.  Rebuttal   * You’re not engaging with the Prop push that co-opts the economic benefits on your side; they claim that due to the overall cost of production staying cheaper despite environmental regulations, they stay in LDCs. * We want to push that the cost of production does dip enough that either they leave, or they move towards automation etc. such that we need to get them to stay. * Did we engage with the principle in Clarisse’s speech?   Extension   * Why does all of this matter more than the environmental harm? If you’re claiming these companies are good for social development - did you establish this first? * We can also focus on cost; cost increases significantly on Proposition’s side in terms of products, even if they still stay in LDCs; what is their willingness to engage with other laws like labour protections if they have lost cost cutting in this way?   + If MNCs face significantly higher costs due to environmental regulations, they may be less willing to invest in other important areas, such as labor protections, fair wages, and community development programs.   + Ask what is more important, a climate restriction, or one that helps workers be treated better. * We spend time characterising what the life of the impoverished is like, but this is done without attention to detail; explain what it means to starve because your job leaves; don’t just say they suffer, or they go hungry. * Why is economic development exclusive? Any impacting here doesn’t engage with their analysis of the cheapness persists despite environmental standards. * Why are the MNCs not as extractive as Prop claims on your side?   05:39  We need to ask POIs consistently. We talked about this last week! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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:  Explain that they had to trade it off - they had to defend economic development, and economic development now because otherwise people starved to death. They were too ambitious. The other thing to address up top is that your side established why this isn’t a debate where Prop has to trade off economic development for the LDCs; they never engaged with this. This means their entire case is not comparative.  Clash 1   * Explain why the MNC is the mechanism through which this technology comes in! On development, explain that sustainable development actually requires balancing economic growth with environmental protection.   + This can only happen on your side, because by enforcing higher environmental standards, MNCs are incentivized to invest in cleaner technologies and sustainable practices, fostering a greener development trajectory. * You should point out the power asymmetry between MNCs and local governments; explain how as a consequence, we must oblige them externally - even if local governments set laws, they will find ways out of it, like tax breaks for employment numbers etc.   + This creates a "race to the bottom" effect, where MNCs relocate to countries with weaker standards to reduce costs, leading to increased pollution and environmental damage. * On accountability - don’t just drop the feasibility line! You need to give me some insight into how regulations occur; maybe linked to the revenue/fines etc.   Clash 2   * Good on bringing in the green tech - this should have been earlier. I don’t understand the clash thematic grouping. * Good work bringing back the cost of production! Explain how they have no response to you as a consequence! * Good on political will - this should have come up earlier.   Good responses, odd organisation of speech.  We needed to bring back the principle push of who suffers the most. The impact only comes at the end - the focus of the argument must be how this creates a double standard and perpetuates global inequalities.   * People in developing countries are disproportionately affected by environmental damage, despite contributing less to global pollution. Explain why this is true as well; why did they have to let this happen to them - because they need the economic development, which they were denied and deprived of due to colonialism.   05:57  We need to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |