| **Student Name:** Karin Yang |
| --- |

| **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 job pushing back against the checks-and-balances.   * While it’s a good conclusion that your side prevents more harm, we need to explain even more reasoning as to WHY the system will fail on their side.   + For example, point out that challenging this in court will require a lot of resources, which disenfranchised minorities won’t have.   Well done with the example of Trump on how many harms materialise and accountability mechanisms fail.   * The reasoning that the harm can be done even by just allowing politicians to campaign is well done.   We should also take down the Opposition's long-term solutions!  We are asserting the idea of voters being emotional and irrational without explaining why. How does Prop get away by assuming they’re all radical.   * 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.   On the argument:   * We are repeating a lot of the rebuttals above! On the candidates being extreme on the campaign trail:   + 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. * The social harms were underanalysed. * Aside from the attacks happening, spend time 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!  6.30 - You cannot go this much over time, please keep your own time! | | | | | | |