| **Student Name:** Isabella Sun |
| --- |

| **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!]  The hook shouldn’t just summarise your stance in the debate!   * Have a high-impact hook about the Proposition stripping away democracy! Conclude here why the debate must be about what is the best interest of a democracy. * Don’t forget that signposting should include the label of your arguments.   After stating that voters are also the ones who are extreme, conclude that therefore Proposition is suggesting a problem-solution mismatch! So the harms will still fester on their side and may be even worse in the bigger picture.  On the harms that society may suffer from, just stating that the majority are the ones who elect them does not rebut the harms that minorities will suffer from!   * Point out that law and order will still exist, and we can still prosecute those who engage in hate crimes and hate speech.   The counter set-up needs to come BEFORE the rebuttals:   * We ended up not saying any beyond saying you support long-term solutions. What are they? What do you even support? * Point out that the Opposition does support certain limits on who runs for office, e.g. citizens, no criminal record, etc. * 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!  On your first argument:   * The democratic checks and balances should be in the set-up or the rebuttals, this isn’t an argument explaining why extremist politicians SHOULD be allowed to campaign.   + But good identification of accountability mechanisms and voters won’t vote for them.     - However, we did not explain WHY. 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. * 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 didn’t end up saying anything more here beyond a one-line assertion. * 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?   We need to offer POIs to both Prop speakers today!  6.00 - We are way overtime! Please keep time during your speech. | | | | | | |