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

| **Motion:** This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the pushback that donation caps will not be effective as a regulation. But this is slightly confusing because the Opposition did not even propose a cap in regulation.   * We should have engaged with the regulation model they did propose, such as transparency requirements.   We are reinforcing that politicians will listen to lobbyists over politicians, but your first speaker never argued this properly! So this should’ve been your opportunity to fulfill this analytical gap.   * We also need to expand your claim on why voters can never compete with lobbyists when it comes to influencing policy decisions beyond the financial power asymmetry, i.e. civilians cannot donate as much as companies. * It is political suicide to abandon your sponsors. * Voters can be convinced using a multitude of other political strategies, thus accountability mechanisms fail.   There is no clear engagement with any of the winning pathways to Opp.   * What about the special interests groups Opp is advocating for?   + Explain the status quo on how it is dominated by mainly bad and wealthy groups.   Good introduction of a point as to how politicians often reject donations as a means of increasing their own political capital, re: Bernie Sanders.   * But be mindful that this is precisely what helps the Opposition in arguing that checks and balances exist so that lobbyists aren’t always successful.   Where are any of the impacts to democracy? Why is representation important? Will this harm participation?   * Can we add on all of the grounding? What are these harmful public policies entirely and uniquely created by powerful lobbyists?   + We need to spend more time characterising the harms that these companies perpetuate! Highlight the human costs, e.g. mass shootings in the US due to the NRA gun lobby.   We need to deal with Opp’s biggest concern, that political campaigns would have completely ineffective outreach with the billions removed from the political market.   * Why will alternative methods of funding be sufficient?   Please offer more POIs today!  5.04 | | | | | | |