| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Stop outing yourself as not having prepped a hook!  We should offer the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.   * We skipped it altogether!! * We need to reset the comparative. 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. * Give me a burden of proof/framing!   On the first rebuttal, good job co-opting Prop’s benefits because we can still call out our opponents even when we are in power. Don’t just wash it out, explain that we have a BETTER ability now that we have a vote in parliament. E.g. Our opponents are forced to engage with us to win our parliamentary vote, so we have better representation.   * We need to engage with Prop’s core analysis, which is the activists have to make ideological compromises as a politician, and this is where the loss of influence happens. * Interesting flip that if they are voted means they do command the influence of the people. However, they could lose influence AFTER being in office.   + Explain things like prominence means they have a level of cult of personality and trust among their base that would not lead to a loss of power.   On mobilising the support of the people, 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.   * Good analysis on why these activists command a lot of hope and interest in the movement.   + But we’re missing the impacting. Why is the mobilisation of the voters the most decisive material in the debate?   On creating change, Prop’s main claim is that these activists will be useless once they are in office. Can you explain how they’re able to balance   * On resources, presumably they ARE the leaders of their movement and can command political and economic support in that way.   On long-term sustainability, good start 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? * We’re deeply lacking grounding, why can’t politicians do the same thing?   Please offer more POIs today!  6.08 | | | | | | |