| **Student Name:** Caitlyn Szeto |
| --- |

| **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.]  It isn’t clear how the hook on oligarchy relates to the motion, do some linkages first.  On the counter set-up:   * Excellent use of Emily’s List to explain that lobby groups aren’t just corporations. Tell me the full range of other lobby groups. * Good use of regulations, don’t say blax3, actually name every single regulation CLEARLY and expand what is the EU model. * We still need a winning pathway/burden.   + Good explanation on knowing where the government does wrong is key, but would politicians have accepted money in a clandestine way otherwise? Why can’t Prop still have transparency in their world?     - Explain that lobbying is uniquely the only way they can improve their advocacy. In contrast, we can easily limit the bad uses of lobbying. So we have unique benefits and we can limit the harm.   + Why can’t these special interest groups advocate their views in alternative ways?   Good case on transparency, but analysing the harms in the comparative is much impactful!   * Without lobbying, politicians will be enabled under a culture of excessive lying. Voters will experience a lot of voter remorse because their true stances will be found later on. * Why is it worse off if the people cannot tell where the allegiances of the politicians are?   Nice argument on why these resources are crucial for the campaigning process. Why are alternatives insufficient to achieve the same ends though?  We cannot just argue in a vacuum on minorities also lobbying, how will they have any ability to compete with corporate lobbyists and be heard of MORE?  We need to engage with Prop’s main analysis that politicians will choose to listen to their lobbyists over their voters, and accountability mechanisms will fail to punish those politicians.   * Explain the true power of voters to override the power of corporate lobbyists. Characterise the voters as having more political consciousness in modern times and they are capable of pushing back against the lobbyists, re: post-2008 Occupy Wall Street led to many politicians refusing to take money from the Wall Street lobby. * Prop said that they’re not able to raise similar sums of money. So why will politicians still listen to their voterbase over the millions in funding?   Please offer more POIs today!  5.04 | | | | | | |