| **Student Name:** Jeffrey Shen |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Excellent hook, but it’s under-executed! We need to reset the comparative clearly here.   * Conclude properly that the movement can still exist as a separate entity and hold the activist-turned-politician accountable, thus co-opting every benefit Prop has given.   I appreciate the burden pushback on Prop getting little to no change as well!   * However, Prop’s case is one of more harm than good. Their harm is now their prominent activist will also be lost because their trusted movement leader will behave similarly. So, we have to deal with the loss. * If you want this burden push, also strategically execute why their burden has to be this high.   Good challenge on Opp having greater abilities than Prop when it comes to actually holding the state accountable/creating change.   * But Prop’s main claim is that these activists will be useless once they are in office. Can we explain what powers they would even have if they are in office? * Explain that political opponents will want to win their vote for policies, thus they are forced to listen to you, thus improving representation. * Point out that some of these activists could also gain office in the executive branch, which grants them immediate power that they don’t have to negotiate away against other politicians.   It’s a good start on why representation alone is a political good in and of itself!   * Don’t reduce the point to just being hopeful, actively mechanise why objections made in Parliament could alter the final bill in motion for more just outcomes to the community. * Mechanise why visibility engineers long-term social change.   On the influence of these activists, well done flipping that these voters won’t turn away against these candidates.   * But bear in mind this proves 2nd Prop’s argument exactly, which is that we can no longer hold these activists-turned-politicians accountable. * While I appreciate that they may have good incentives based on how they would have earned the prominence, we're not engaging in Prop's analysis on why political structures in power will actively reverse these incentives!   + Why will their moral character survive those political structures? 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?   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.   * Explain the uniqueness of these prominent leaders, their cult of personality is what we need to mobilise the vote.   + We did this later on, good job!   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.   * Good job pointing out that the movement can still exist as a separate entity and hold the activist-turned-politician accountable, thus co-opting every benefit Prop has given.   Style-wise:   * The speech structure is all over the place! Consolidate your attacks thematically, conclude, and highlight where the positive material even is. * Slow down, Jeffrey, a lot of content is falling through the cracks if I can’t track it.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.15 | | | | | | |