| **Student Name:** Chloe Lit |
| --- |

| **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!]  Nice hook, some illustrations would really drive the point home!   * Don’t forget to signpost the rest of the speech.   On the set-up:   * Well done on the definition of extremists. Good use of examples to prove the point. * Nicely done stating that this is an extension of the status quo. * We can include more strategy in the set-up such as 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:   * Aside from stating that these politicians are just extreme, we will benefit from characterising why many political tactics reward extremism due to its emotional appeal.   + 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.     - Highlight that Trump’s election proves the prevalence of this strategy. * I appreciate us pointing out the levels of harm that result from this.   + After explaining that the politicians are influential, we need more characterisation of the lived experiences of minorities beyond just a general statement of trauma.   On the second argument:   * Well done highlighting the groups of voters who will end up living in complete fear, it’s a good impacting of the first argument. * However, the impact on having more violence needs to engage with the fact that we still have law and order on the ground.   + Other impacts like parents restricting the movement of children are too far-out and contingent on you proving first that society will collapse as a result of extremist rhetoric. * We have to first spend time proving why voters are emotional and irrational.   + 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.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.46 - We are under-timed, try to reach 5 minutes. | | | | | | |