| **Student Name:** Christy Yuan |
| --- |

| **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 a summative hook that reinforces the motion.   * Good job signposting!   I appreciate that you’re reinforcing that Opp’s alternatives have many flaws and bad laws may still pass!   * We can add even more reasoning here, e.g. point out that challenging this in court will require a lot of resources, which disenfranchised minorities won’t have. * Add a clear comparison that the harm can be done even by just allowing politicians to campaign is well done.   Good job engaging with the Opposition’s long-term solutions!   * Aside from just questioning if this will work, give multiple reasons why it definitely will fail.   + E.g. There is a lack of trust between the extremists and the state, they will refuse to listen to your educational campaigns.   On the first clash of free democracy:   * We’re not explaining why the right to vote whoever we want is not an absolute right.   + The metric to not allow harmful opinions is too vague, many things are subjectively harmful and yet we allow it to happen.     - We should point out that if these politicians moderate themselves, they can still run for office so we are not entirely taking away democratic choices! * Explain why participation and representation is less important than constitutional rights.   The second clash on safety is already repeated in the first clash!   * However, the impact on having more violence needs to engage with the fact that we still have law and order on the ground.   + All impacts are 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.   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!  5.00 | | | | | | |