| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  Clear hook, but it functions more as a summation, rather than a high-impact hook.  On the set-up:   * Please don’t concede that you’re riffing and you have no clue what the model is! Do SOMETHING. * Point out specifically how funding will be raised in your new world, so that politicians can continue campaigning without corporate money. E.g. all campaigns will be using grassroots people-based campaigns. * We could use some illustrations on who are the dominant lobby groups. * We still need a winning pathway/burden.   On why we can’t hold politicians accountable:   * We’re missing the linkage as to why this analysis is crucial in a lobbying debate.   + Link it to why even though lobbyists can be both good and bad, it is dominated by mainly bad and wealthy groups, and these politicians can never be held accountable for prioritising lobbyists over voters.   + We should’ve focused specifically on why regulation of lobbying would not have been successful. * If the politician has a cult of personality, it isn’t clear why they even needed to take money from lobbyists in order to win elections. * We’re repeating stock analysis without making it nuanced to this specific motion, re: flaws of accountability.   Don’t concede that you don’t know the difference between lobbying and funding, when your final answer is actually accurate!  We need to spend more time characterising the harms that these companies perpetuate!   * We also need to explain why voters can never compete with lobbyists when it comes to influencing policy decisions: * There is power asymmetry. 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.   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?   + Highlight the human costs, e.g. mass shootings in the US due to the NRA gun lobby.   Why must it specifically use a ban model instead of a regulation model? We know Opp will regulate it, so explain the ease of enforcement with a complete ban.  Be comparative with Opp’s biggest concern, that political campaigns would have completely ineffective outreach with the billions removed from the political market.  Good job offering POIs today!  4.20 - We are severely under-timed! | | | | | | |