| **Student Name:** Aria Punjabi |
| --- |

| **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!]  Well done with the hook and the signposting!  Good start rebutting that Proposition is stripping away democracy! Conclude here why the debate must be about what is the best interest of a democracy.   * After pointing out that it’s a problem-solution mismatch, then point out what is your counterfactual.   + Why is your comparative solution better?   We moved on to the argument too fast! We haven’t rebutted any of their arguments yet, your first rebuttal is actually just mentioning your own argument.  On utilising democratic checks and balances, 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 should also 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.   As the second speaker, we should use arguments and rebuttals, rather than clashes immediately.  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 feels like they can be represented in the political system. * We have to outline the potential harm of lack of cooperation and buy-in in a democratic system if people don’t feel like the system is fair to them.   + We need to then explain why it’s difficult for the state to govern or implement any policies at all without societal cooperation. * We asserted that long-term educational policies will work without really ever explaining why.   + Why will extremists be willing to listen to someone who banned their representatives from competing for office?   + On not completely banning them, explain that if these politicians are able to moderate themselves, then we can allow them the right to contest elections once again!   We need to offer POIs to both Prop speakers today!  5.18 | | | | | | |