| **Student Name:** Edna Ka Ching Chow |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 linking to the desires and interests of sports fans - connect this to how this interest does align to this boycott; why does the fan care about this. This is a clear opening, but we do have some pauses here and there.  Set-up   * What is the framing from Prop for this debate? * Good use of examples to demonstrate what these HRVs might look like; you may also want to explain how these HRV affect the fan, or the athlete or the event - so as to create a stronger relationship with the actor in the motion. Remember that this is an actor debate; this about what we think an individual actor should do. Can we explain what the interests of these fans are? What do they want?   Argument 1   * Can we link this incentive to why the host country bid in the first place? What do they want to achieve when they bid? For instance, trying to soften the blow to their international reputation? * You think they should value, but need to explain why they can or do value this; we need to explain why they have an incentive to do so! Maybe it is that they feel unsafe, or their athlete feels unsafe, or it affects the quality of the competition? * On losing money - we need to explain why there is a monetary incentive that gets attacked when a boycott happens; how does it change the purpose of hosting the competition - link this to why countries bid to host these events. * On the impact - on the locals, we can only prove this if we explain how exactly the change occurs. We need to explain how these countries will change their behaviour, where it can be changed, such as better working conditions for migrant workers?   We need to dive deeper into the incentives of a sports fan, what their interests are and so forth - this is an actor motion!  05:05  We need to ask more POIs - this is a comment that applies to everyone! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 think rather than conceding that HRVs are bad, we should attack whether or not an incentive to boycott on part of the fan exists; do they have any interest in doing so? Or maybe them showing up is the means through which change and awareness can occur. Good on the local people - explain how the boycott hurts them the most because of how likely a change in behaviour from these countries is.  We need to do set-up prior to rebuttal. What does your side support? What do you want to achieve? Is it that we want to make sure they go so they can see how bad it is?  Rebuttal   * Good on message of attendance. Explain how high the barrier to entry to boycotting is for a sports fan; especially if the impact is minimal/sports fans are not political actors. They don’t get to choose which country the event will be hosted in. * Make it about likelihood of change; will they stop their HRV because fans boycott? If anything, they need to attend for people to understand what is happening and for there to be global attention on this function. Governments may be resistant to external pressure, particularly if they perceive the boycott as interference in their internal affairs. Furthermore, boycotts can sometimes backfire and lead to unintended negative consequences, such as increased repression or a hardening of the government's stance. The targeted country might become more isolated and less open to dialogue, hindering rather than helping the human rights situation.   Argument 1   * Fair on the athletes and their suffering - why does this matter more to the sports fans? * Good on lack of local control over the situation; how does the boycott hurt them, and why does the sports fan care?   Argument 2   * Good impact on tourism! You can go a step further - frame this point as you assuming the boycott even works. Boycotts often disproportionately affect ordinary citizens, local businesses, and athletes in the host country who rely on the event for income and opportunity. These individuals are rarely the ones responsible for the human rights abuses, and a boycott can deprive them of livelihoods and chances for advancement. For example, small business owners who cater to tourists, local vendors, and hospitality workers are all likely to suffer economic hardship if a major event is boycotted.   We need to challenge if what Prop says even works!  05:11  We need to ask more POIs - this is a comment that applies to everyone! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** James Gao |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  We need to start with a proper hook!  Rebuttal   * What are we responding to here? We can’t just forward our own idea without directly responding to what the other side says. We need to systematise responses; Opp says ‘three things’ etc. * We need to explain why the boycott matters, even where it hurts the locals; we assert HRV matter more, but we need to justify the weighing! * Why do the sports fans care about the things you want them to in this instance! * Is it that easy to change the minds of these governments committing HRV? Analyse how major sporting events attract global media attention. A boycott can shift some of that focus onto the host country's human rights record, raising awareness and putting pressure on international bodies to act. * What are the implications of our responses?   Argument 1   * We need to analyse why countries commit HRV, and hence analyse how likely change is likely to be; similarly on why they bid. * Why do athletes feel this way, and more importantly, why do sports fans care about this? * Can we link this incentive to why the host country bid in the first place? What do they want to achieve when they bid? For instance, trying to soften the blow to their international reputation? * You think they should value, but need to explain why they can or do value this; we need to explain why they have an incentive to do so! Maybe it is that they feel unsafe, or their athlete feels unsafe, or it affects the quality of the competition? * On losing money - we need to explain why there is a monetary incentive that gets attacked when a boycott happens; how does it change the purpose of hosting the competition - link this to why countries bid to host these events. * Why is good morals more important?   We need to dive deeper into the incentives of a sports fan, what their interests are and so forth - this is an actor motion; link this to the overall culture and environment of sports you chat about.  04:34  We need to ask more POIs - this is a comment that applies to everyone! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Wendy Zhang |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Let’s try to have an even higher impact opening next time!  Rebuttal   * Good on why the likelihood of change is low; unpack why or how these countries commit HRV and why a boycott won’t change these decisions. Will they stop their HRV because fans boycott? If anything, they need to attend for people to understand what is happening and for there to be global attention on this function. Governments may be resistant to external pressure, particularly if they perceive the boycott as interference in their internal affairs. Furthermore, boycotts can sometimes backfire and lead to unintended negative consequences, such as increased repression or a hardening of the government's stance. The targeted country might become more isolated and less open to dialogue, hindering rather than helping the human rights situation. * Good on athlete safety, and why this is a non-issue.   Argument 1   * Excellent idea - connect this to the likelihood of change. Explain how positive relationships are more likely to convince the country that what they are doing is wrong or needs to be changed! * Rather than chaos, it is that there are checks and balances - media reporting, backlash and so forth. * Personal connection - good on stereotypes and hostility - what is the impact of hostility decreasing?   Explain how high the barrier to entry to boycotting is for a sports fan; especially if the impact is minimal/sports fans are not political actors. They don’t get to choose which country the event will be hosted in.  We need to look up whilst delivering our speech. We don’t really make much eye contact! We also hold our hands together, rather than using hand gestures or projecting confidence.  05:30 - excellent time today! Well done!  Good work asking a POI! Let’s ask more of them next time! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  On safety, we need to explain why there won’t be specific protections for sports people, or how locals matter more to fans. Remember that this is an actor debate! You have to link this to the incentive of sports fans; why is this tied to their own self interest, or why is there a moral obligation to take action here.  We need to have two clashes! One clash is pretty much the entire debate.  Clash 1   * Why do fans have any incentive to behave in this way, or to care about this? Consider how these HRV may affect them, or even affect athletes. Do they feel safe attending? Do teams have any obligations to fans - if their fans are part of the LGBT community and the match is being held in Russia? * On safety - good on visitors; explain how likely or true this is! Why would they get fined; POI - point out the harms to fans specifically; and link this to the incentives of the fan. * We need to explain why the boycott matters, even where it hurts the locals; we assert HRV matter more, but we need to justify the weighing! * Why do the sports fans care about the things you want them to in this instance! * Is it that easy to change the minds of these governments committing HRV? Analyse how major sporting events attract global media attention. A boycott can shift some of that focus onto the host country's human rights record, raising awareness and putting pressure on international bodies to act. * What are the implications of our responses?   On losing money - we need to explain why there is a monetary incentive that gets attacked when a boycott happens; how does it change the purpose of hosting the competition - link this to why countries bid to host these events.  We need to speak with more confidence!  We need to ask more POIs - this is a comment that applies to everyone!  04:45 | | | | | | |