| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 are7 minutes’ long.]  **Hook**   * This was well done! I like you talked about why the perception of elected officials being n   **Setup**   * I like the nuances of case documents being public, to have timelines of legal case, and to have financial support! * You could use these elements of your setup later in your speech. It seems unfortunately they were dropped later down the line!   **Rebuttals**   * You pointed out the gaps in the proposition case well! * But you did not take advantage of it. Eg, you could explain why a lot of public officials are individuals with good values, and that they have good intentions to run for public office!   **Argument 1**   * I am unclear why malicious actors exist against public officials. You could explain what their profit incentive is, and what they generally aim for! * You could give more time to explain why the average public official is likely to have opposing candidates to drag them down!   **Argument 2**   * I am unclear why public interest is damaged, because this assumes voters are able to make more informed votes with the information they have access to! * You deprioritized this argument way too much! You spent only the last 50 seconds on this. This had more potential. * You could explain here why the average voter is easily misled, what power the media holds in that process, and so on!   **Style**   * Your initial speech tone was very low and with little energy. We want to have the entirety of the speech with high energy! * You had good tonal variation today at the later part of the speech, this is good! * We need to get some hand gestures in! This makes speeches a lot more engaging!   **Structure**   * I am unclear when you started the first argument! The transition from rebuttal to the first argument was not clear! You did have a good transition moving to your second argument! * Try to give explicit labelling of your arguments so that your speech becomes easier to follow!   Please take and offer POIs!  *Speaking time: 7.07!* | | | | | | |