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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 start pointing out that paying ransoms doesn't solve anything, but perpetuate the problem further. It would be even more impactful if we explained that for every hostage’s life we save, we sacrifice many more in order to make this point.   * Good signposting.   On the set-up:   * I appreciate the mechanism of following the digital trail of financial transactions in order to enforce the ban effectively.   + There was no need to propose lifelong imprisonment as the final penalty, you are making your policy unnecessarily harsh and difficult to defend. * We should insert a strategic model on potentially cracking down on kidnappings, have missions to save hostages and warning civilians and journalists away from these danger zones.   + We cannot just abandon these people in danger without doing something else to make up for it. * Don’t forget that you should have a burden of proof!   On the first argument:   * The analogy of these terrorist organisations being children who are throwing tantrums may be a little too trivialising, since the stakes are much higher and people will die as a result of your policy. * Good logical reasoning about the ransoms being used to strengthen the operations of these terrorist organisations.   + We need to expand the impact of this even more!     - What kind of damage can they wield by receiving these millions of dollars? What attacks can they organise?     - We should characterise that the amount of money these organisations ask are extremely high, and why they will be able to ask for more and more money over time. * We need a little bit more linkages before we argue that citizens are afraid of kidnappings, because most of your civilians who are afraid can simply avoid these danger areas.   + We may have gone a little too far with these civilians refusing to cooperate with the state! Most people comply with laws even when they don’t like or trust their state.   Good job weighing the human costs involved, and we have to prioritise the masses.   * Good reasoning that consent is a mitigating factor because those kidnapped consented to the risks of being kidnapped.   Well done offering POIs in the debate!  6.03 | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 should use our hook to attack, rather than just observations to add clarity when it isn’t necessarily needed.   * Good signposting.   When we argue that terrorist organisations shouldn’t even exist in the first place, we need to articulate clearly that cracking down on terrorism has always had questionable efficacy.   * Then explain clearly WHY do you think the Opposition's counter set-up is not effective, rather than just asserting that it’s known that the state will fail. * The more strategic conclusion should have been that Proposition can ALSO crack down but you can do so more effectively, because we didn’t just financially empower those same organisations by millions of dollars.   On the illegal ways in which terrorist organisations earn money will actively hurt others:   * Explain how they will use their money to fuel the black market, and tell me what kind of black market and what kind of harm will be caused. * What kind of damage can they wield by receiving these millions of dollars? What attacks can they organise?   + We should characterise that the amount of money these organisations ask is extremely high, and why they will be able to ask for more and more money over time.   On the citizens living in fear, why can’t the civilians who are afraid simply avoid these danger areas?   * We need to engage with Opp’s rebuttal that the people who are kidnapped are not the average civilian living in peaceful areas, it’s those who are stuck in danger zones. So why are they only afraid now after your policy? Isn’t fear of terrorist organisations the default setting?   While I appreciate the characterisation of how brutal the Talibans are in Afghanistan, bear in mind that they are now the government who have legitimate ways in which to earn money.   * So it’s slightly removed from the motion because these groups no longer have to utilise kidnapping as a means of surviving.   Try to spend time weighing the human costs involved, and explain why we have to prioritise the masses.   * Point out that consent is a mitigating factor because those kidnapped consented to the risks of being kidnapped.   Don’t accept the POI right away, wait until you’re done with your train of thought.  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.10 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Christy 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: | 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:  Is the observation that many countries already ban ransoms a useful observation for you? This makes it strategically easier for Prop to defend since it’s the default policy for most.  On the set-up:   * Clarifying that it’s often journalists who are victims is correct and useful! Take one step further and conclude that therefore, this debate is also about the government abandoning the media overall. * We should explain what the paying of ransoms looks like in the Opposition’s world!   + We can strategically include other missions to crack down on terrorist organisations even after paying them the ransom, in order to limit the kind of harm they can wield with extra resources.   We eventually mentioned it later on in the rebuttals about cracking down on the illegal weapons market to limit the kind of damage they’re capable of causing, well done!  Good rebuttal that the people being kidnapped are not the wealthy, but stating the people kidnapped are the average citizen does not help your conclusion that civilians will not live in fear.   * Make it clear that citizens who fear kidnappings can very easily avoid the risk by not living in these conflict-zones.   We need to move into our arguments at 3:00, instead of 4:30!  On the first argument:   * I appreciate you highlighting that the ban extends to private actors who have the means and obligation to save their loved ones.   + Here, explain that this is a state overreach of duty and they are complicit in the losses of lives. * We asserted that the state has an obligation to not abandon these civilians, but where does this obligation come from? * We need to expand the moral impact of this state failure even more!   + Explain that the public backlash will make it difficult for the state to continue their presence in these areas.   + Point out that media organisations not being protected will harm their role within these conflict zones.   Good job offering POIs in the debate, you could offer to both speakers as well.  5.50 - So close to 6 minutes!! Let’s go for 6 next time! | | | | | | |