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

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  Why are we suddenly using an opening that starts with imagine; using this exact scenario you can illustrate the injustice of this in any other way! No imagines, illustrate how cheated such athletes may feel instead. Fair stance on what is wrong with this motion; they want national diversity not racial diversity.  We’re not signposting - we need to say what the structure of our speech will be! For instance, three things in this speech - first, set-up, and then two arguments - the first on the principle injustice of a quota, and the second on xyz.  Model   * Clear on qualifications - you should emphasise that it should be competitive and meritocratic. * Fair burden identification!   Argument 1 - Principally Unjust   * What is the thesis of this argument? * Good illustration of who loses out, and where this applies. Establish the status quo more systematically; why is the system the way that it is and who loses out; good identification of how the best often get left behind. What is the impact of this? You move onto the next problem, but don’t tell me why this is bad. Unpack the impact! * Why should it be skill based or merit based? * POI: explain how or why this is bad; where yes, that is what it is about in SQ - but it should not be this way. * We never justify why skill should be the focus, but assert that it matters the most. Why is this the purpose of the competition?   Argument 2   * Thesis? * Why does money-making matter? Why is engagement higher with competition, rather than national participation? What makes people interested in viewing sports? We need to answer these questions!   The analytical rigour in our arguments isn’t improving! We have to force ourselves to add more analysis in our argument + actually impact if the motion leads to the outcome we claim + what the impact of this outcome is. You didn’t unpack any impacts!  04:56  You have to speak louder and with more confidence.  We need to ask and offer POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hon Sum Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  The China opening is great! It illustrates the problem with Proposition very clearly; say it with more confidence + pay attention to clarity; you speak in a muffled + pause-y manner.  Signposting is too extensive; first set-up, then rebuttal - and then an argument about x; our argument title is too long at the moment.  Set-up   * You can say you support SQ - and explain why it exists because of the unique nature of the Olympics.   Rebuttal   * Good work bringing back the POI you asked; but the clarification here doesn’t present me with an implication for the debate; why do we want everyone to be able to fight for their each country. Why is the Olympics different from other competitions - and why should it remain in this way? * You have no response to the argument being made about merit and skill from Prop! Engage!   Argument 1   * I buy dominance exists, you have to explain why it is BAD. * Why should all countries get an equal chance? * You need to unpack origins + why it is this way; why the purpose is distinct from other sporting competitions; it is about national competition and the singular best person in the nation; there are individual sporting championships for this distinct purpose. Justify why this is the way it should be; give me an example of what this looks like! * Establish status quo systematically; why is the system the way that it is and who loses out if it gets changed - which countries won’t have anyone to send and why? You aren’t diving deeper into this! What is the impact of this? Unpack the impact! * You need to tell me why it is better for the Olympics to value national cooperation; or why or how it even does in the first place. * Good point on developed/developing countries - talk about sports development further; and why or how the Olympics incentivises development!   We need to sound more confident; our tone makes it sound like we are very doubtful of what we are saying!  05:03 - Nice job!  Good work asking a POI! Do it more consistently. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  Excellent style in the opening; after the initial identification, you need to point out how all of this was unresponded in 1O; punish them for not engaging with their case.  Signposting missing!  Rebuttal   * Unfair - you need to first call out that they never explain why fairness on the basis of representation matters in the first place; then engage with this. I think you counter-assert your definition of fairness, without explaining why your interpretation of fairness matters more. You have good illustrations of how the individual athlete feels - you need to explain why this matters more than the representation Opp wants to protect. * Give up and no incentive to practise - you need to engage with this in the context of countries competing; re - why do under resourced countries do worse? Is it because talent doesn’t exist, or capital for training and coaching doesn’t exist? How does your side deal with this problem?   Establish the status quo more systematically; why is the system the way that it is and who loses out; good identification of how the best often get left behind. What is the impact of this? You move onto the next problem, but don’t tell me why this is bad. Unpack the impact! We never justify why skill should be the focus, but assert that it matters the most. Why is this the purpose of the competition?  What is the spirit of sport? This is an interesting argument, but you need to unpack this in greater detail!  05:17  We need to be careful with the amount of analysis we engage in! You must try to provide multiple reasons for something. For example, if you suggest that things are going to get more fair - why is that true; what is fairness beyond just skill and merit - is it because everyone can work hard or do well but don’t and hence it is unfair?  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  Fair caveat on how it won’t be complete amateurs - but why does it mean that skill and merit still get preserved?  I think we need to explain how the sport works, such as that in the final rounds - all these other countries fall away anyways; these people participate maybe on Day 1, and then get eliminated and then do anything; the competition is only concentrated at the top.  Good on incentive and drive; link this to what your 1st Speaker says on countries and explain why some countries are just worse and cannot provide fair competition - why is there such a disparity or gap in competition; do they have an incentive to develop or fund sports in a world where they do not have this quota at the Olympics?  Can we have equal/open competition if the playing field wasn’t fair - is it just hard work at play then? Or is Prop’s understanding of fairness wrong?  You need to unpack origins + why it is this way; why the purpose is distinct from other sporting competitions; it is about national competition and the singular best person in the nation; there are individual sporting championships for this distinct purpose. Justify why this is the way it should be; give me an example of what this looks like!  Argument - slightly repetitive to the rebuttal you already have!  Why do we want other countries to be able to win? We argue competition and engagement - why or how does your side keep these and why are these outcomes that matter in the round?  Same comments as above on under-resourced countries apply!  05:21  We have to offer POIs in the debate! We check out before because we’re writing our speech and after because we’re looking at our phone! Don’t do this! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  We are speaking louder today and actively making eye contact - this is a great thing! However, we are still reading.  Is this about fans who don’t get to see their favourite athletes, or is it about hard work being taken away? Make sure the focus up top is as clear as possible - we also suddenly talk about the popularity of the Olympics.  Good job signposting your clashes - what is the title of each?  Clash 1 - Fairness   * On resources - we are summarising too much again; do you need to also summarise the China example; don’t present it as Opposition believes this is unfair; this is not a summary essay! Instead - explain why or how this is unfair; why they had access to resources, had access to skill, but still didn’t do well, or even if it is unfair and they are under privileged, you don’t care and value merit more? * What is the outcome of this clash? What is the takeaway here? You need to tell me what you have proven and what the implication is on their case? * You need to first call out that they never explain why fairness on the basis of representation matters in the first place; then engage with this. I think you counter-assert your definition of fairness, without explaining why your interpretation of fairness matters more. You have good illustrations of how the individual athlete feels - you need to explain why this matters more than the representation Opp wants to protect.   Clash 2 - competition   * Why does competition go away? Status quo is quotas - is it that competition doesn’t exist? Is this a realistic characterisation of status quo? * Are they actually amateurs…? * You need to engage with this in the context of countries competing; re - why do under resourced countries do worse? Is it because talent doesn’t exist, or capital for training and coaching doesn’t exist? How does your side deal with this problem?   05:01 - good work!  We need to be careful with the amount of analysis we engage in! You must try to provide multiple reasons for something. For example, if you suggest that things are going to get more fair - why is that true; what is fairness beyond just skill and merit - is it because everyone can work hard or do well but don’t and hence it is unfair?  We didn’t ask a single POI in this debate - you have to make sure you’re asking at least one POi to each speaker!  The reading continues - if your notes are full sentences this is not great! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Karin Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would remove the Olympic quota system |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 4 to 5 minutes’ long.]  Our opening needs to highlight WHY there is a gap in achievement - because the other countries don’t have resources to develop their talent! Which countries don’t do well and why? Establish this up top and then proceed from here. You say this, but not as explicitly as possible!  **We then need to signpost the structure of our speech; in this speech, I will offer two clashes - the first on x, the second on b… we cannot do speaker by speaker rebuttal at this level. If you’re unsure HOW - ask me and I’ll help you out!**  I think we need to explain how the sport works, such as that in the final rounds - all these other countries fall away anyways; these people participate maybe on Day 1, and then get eliminated and then do anything; the competition is only concentrated at the top.  Good on incentive and drive; link this to what your 1st Speaker says on countries and explain why some countries are just worse and cannot provide fair competition - why is there such a disparity or gap in competition; do they have an incentive to develop or fund sports in a world where they do not have this quota at the Olympics?  Can we have equal/open competition if the playing field wasn’t fair - is it just hard work at play then? Or is Prop’s understanding of fairness wrong?  You need to unpack origins + why it is this way; why the purpose is distinct from other sporting competitions; it is about national competition and the singular best person in the nation; there are individual sporting championships for this distinct purpose. Justify why this is the way it should be; give me an example of what this looks like!  Why do we want other countries to be able to win? We argue competition and engagement - why or how does your side keep these and why are these outcomes that matter in the round?  05:22 - good!  We didn’t ask a single POI in this debate - you have to make sure you’re asking at least one POi to each speaker! | | | | | | |