| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **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.]  On the call-out, can we immediately prove that the state will not listen to the movement unless they possess actual political power?   * I like the claim and example, but it’s relying on only rhetoric at this point, rather than a reasoning as to why the state can easily ignore the movement if they do not run for office.   Can we explain what powers they would even have if they are in office? We cannot just assert this when Prop has argued that these activists are still in the minority when they are in the state, so they cannot do anything still.   * Explain that political opponents will want to win their vote for policies, thus they are forced to listen to you, thus improving representation.   Can you signpost ALL of the clashes before diving into them?  I appreciate the reinforcement that nothing changes without legislative power, but we can engage with their specific analysis on being able to engage in protests, media scrutiny, and so on and so forth.   * Explain the movement can still exist as a separate entity and hold the activist-turned-politician accountable, thus co-opting every benefit Prop has given.   + We can have all the protests and scrutiny, AND the new political power brought by the activist-turned-politician.   We need to engage with Prop’s core analysis, which is that activists have to make ideological compromises as a politician, and this is where the loss of influence happens.   * Otherwise, your politician will make changes but not towards a productive end.   Why can’t these activists throw their support to other political candidates who represent the movement? It does not have to be them in particular who have to run for office.   * Explain the uniqueness of these prominent leaders, their cult of personality is what we need to mobilise the vote.   + We eventually referenced this a little bit later on, good job!   + But we’re missing the impacting. Why is the mobilisation of the voters the most decisive material in the debate?   Good reinforcement that activists in particular have good motivations. But we’re not explaining why incentives equal capabilities.   * Would these incentives not erode in order to survive the political system? Prop has highlighted that there are many political factors that destroy the good intentions of activists. * We’re deeply lacking grounding, why can’t politicians do the same thing?   Please offer more POIs today!  6.07 | | | | | | |