| **Student Name:** Candice Chen |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will ban extremists from running for elected office |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long!]  We should prepare a high-impact hook, rather than just reinstating the motion.   * We have to signpost the rest of the speech as well.   Instead of diving right into proving that voters are irrational, tell me what you are rebutting!   * We ended too early by saying they are emotional, explain how so. Why won’t they be rational when this involves their own interest?   + Explain that the emotional tactics used by politicians feed into their vulnerable state of mind, because a lot of these voters are aggrieved by issues like the lack of opportunities.   I really enjoyed the depiction of children being put into cages as a demonstration of biased policies.   * We shouldn’t just propose this point out of nowhere, explain to me what the thesis of your point is. * Explain properly that the Opposition does not solve these problems in the status quo.   In response to the POI, after explaining that voters are irrational, why is this a sufficient metric to take away the right to vote?   * We should point out that the Opposition also concedes that democracies are allowed to take away voters’ choices, because they also agree with not allowing criminals to stand for office.   + So they agree that if certain candidates are inherently harmful, they should not be allowed to be a democratic choice.   + We can also point out that these choices are not permanently taken away, we restore them if these candidates choose to moderate.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  2.51 - We are under-timed, try to aim for 3 minutes. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bea Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will ban extremists from running for elected office |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long!]  We should prepare a high-impact hook to start with, rather than just reinforcing the motion.  On the set-up:   * Well done on the definition of extremists. Good use of examples when it comes to the metric of discrimination. * Good strategic set-up on limiting the ban to one electoral cycle.   + We should explicitly conclude that therefore, if these politicians moderate themselves, they can still run for office so we are not entirely taking away democratic choices! * We still need a burden/winning pathway!   On the first argument:   * Good characterisation of toxic political tactics that are quite extreme.   + However, the conclusion of all this is merely that these tactics exist, and they were used at some point in history, re: Nazi Germany.   + So we still need a logical analysis as to the incentives of politicians, and why a lot of them actively resort to these extremist tactics.     - Point out that using the blame game towards minority groups helps them evade accountability for their own policy failures. * I appreciate us pointing out that Trump’s election proves the prevalence of this strategy.   On the second argument:   * We are phrasing the idea of voters being emotional and irrational as a rebuttal, but we are 1st Prop. Phrase it like a claim. * Spend more time characterising the psyche of voters and why this tactic is incredibly persuasive for people who are aggrieved for a multiple of reasons. They are also blinded by the hatred, and engage in emotional call-to-action.   The social harms were underanalysed.   * Illustrate the human costs so that the judge can visualise the severity of the violation of human rights.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.24 - We are under-timed, try to reach 5 minutes. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will ban extremists from running for elected office |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long!]  Excellent hook about the Proposition stripping away democracy! Conclude here why the debate must be about what is the best interest of a democracy.   * Good job signposting.   On the counter set-up:   * I appreciate the clarity that the Opposition does support certain limits on who runs for office, e.g. citizens, no criminal record, etc. * Well done pointing out the checks-and-balances in the electoral process that will scrutinise every political candidate. * On utilising the structure of government, conclude clearly that ONE bad politician will have limited ability to pass bad laws.   + Aside from needing a majority to pass a law, point out how courts can nullify bad laws, and both the executive and the legislative can correct each other. * We still need a burden/winning pathway!   The rebuttal of this cutting away the meaning of a democracy will overlap with your argument, save this for later!  Good pushback on voters being emotional.   * We should explain why the MAJORITY of voters are quite rational, and these voters will have a greater impact in the final electoral outcome than the emotional voters.   We needed some engagement to Prop’s point on the social harms enacted by extremist politicians.   * Explain why there are many ways to limit the abuse of power.   On your first argument:   * Good starting point that these extremists will feel disenfranchised, and push back against the system.   + We have to link this back to the purpose of the democratic system, which is to ensure that every voter feel like they can be represented in the political system. * We ended very early by just outlining the potential harm of lack of cooperation and buy-in.   + We need to then explain why it’s difficult for the state to govern or implement any policies at all without societal cooperation.   We need to offer POIs to both Prop speakers today!   * Good job offering a POI to 2nd Prop.   5.22 | | | | | | |