| **Student Name:** Jake Ip |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good reinforcement on lobbying being rooted in power asymmetry, execute this observation fully and explain that this takes down their winning pathway on minorities also need lobbying. They don’t have as much money and the financial elite will overpower their interests within this medium.  I appreciate the call-out that lobbying is not unique, but try to be charitable as Opp did analyse that money allows them to have a direct audience with the political representatives, and they have been successful such as with Emily’s List.   * So to fully execute this rebuttal, tell me what advocacy alternatives that can be just as successful as lobbying.   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?   Well done in characterising that the groups dominating lobbying are corporations with perverse interests.   * Don’t end here!! 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.   I appreciate the reinforcement on why voters can never compete with lobbyists when it comes to influencing policy decisions:   * 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. * Explain the fact that politicians will be blacklisted in future elections if they betray lobbyists. * Voters can be convinced using a multitude of other political strategies, so it’s difficult to hold politicians accountable.   Why must it specifically use a ban model instead of a regulation model? Opp has already proposed a lot of regulations, so try to be engaging with why the regulations would not have been effective in constraining all of your harms.  Where are any of the impacts to democracy? Why is representation important? Will this harm participation?  Please offer more POIs today!  5.15 | | | | | | |