| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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.]  On the call-out in the hook, good observation that all of their harms are broadly symmetrical. However, 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.  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 politicians having to pander to the majority, this is precisely Prop’s point! Are we agreeing with them?   * We need to engage with Prop’s core analysis, which is that activists have to make ideological compromises as a politician, and this is where the loss of influence happens.   We should be co-opting Prop’s benefits because we can still call out our opponents even when we are in power. We can even go further and 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.  On spurring communities into more hope, explain properly why these minorities were lacking political participation to begin with. Low voter turnout needs to be a problem first, before we go into increasing voter turnout.   * 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 eventually said this later on, well done.   + But we’re missing the impacting. Why is the mobilisation of the voters the most decisive material in the debate?   We need to spend more time to explain that these 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? Prop has highlighted that there are many political factors that destroy the good intentions of activists. * 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.   We have to frame the case on why these positions of power will win the debate! Point out 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.   * 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. We can have all the protests and scrutiny, AND the new political power brought by the activist-turned-politician.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.27 - We are severely under-timed! | | | | | | |