| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that prominent civil rights activists should not run for elections |
| --- |

| 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 |
| Competition Score: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  Interesting start on how prominent civil rights activists actually gain their prominence, but when we stated that this level of influence and radical ideology cannot exist if they were politicians, we have to immediately prove this assertion and tell us why not.  On set-up:   * I appreciate the clarity on who these activists are. * We need to set up the comparative of these debates clearly!   + In your world, what role will they then play in the political system as just an activist? * I need a burden/framing/winning pathway.   On the first argument:   * We are asserting that politicians HAVE to make ideological compromises without necessarily explaining why. What are the structural incentives of politicians and why can’t they just insist on their original principles? * On the impact of losing their original batch of followers, we need to characterise the psyche of these voter base and why they will turn against these activists.   + Haven’t they earned a cult of personality strong enough to still hold on to their voter base?   + Do these voters even have other political alternatives to turn to? Do they just not go out and vote?   + Try to expand the political impact to even killing the movement overall due to the loss of their leader.     - Why is it critical for movement to hold on to the mobilisation of their critical mass?   Good job flipping the comparative on how they can better perform their role pressuring the state from the outside!   * We’re layering on the mechanisms, such as protests, without really going deep into each to explain why the state will listen to these movements (since these movements lack political power of their own). * We can afford to be even more comparative when it comes to why people who are IN OFFICE are actually completely powerless. This is not something we can just assert.   + Explain that lawmakers make little impact as individuals and they have to garner a simple majority still to make any tangible change in office.   We need to incorporate the democratic principles we learned today, and explain why accurate representation of the movement is the most important material of the debate.  Please offer more POIs today!  6.07 | | | | | | |