| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  What change? Why is this the exclusive mechanism for change? What strategic value is our opening adding to this debate?  Set-up   * Is our problem characterisation that this hurts the average individual and voter? This needs to have more detail + an explanation as to why they need to be the priority in the debate. * How and why is lobbying different from donations? What’s the distinction here?   Argument 1   * What will you prove within this argument? What is the thesis or claim? Didn’t you say earlier that donations are actually allowed? * Fair analysis of how people are poor, and lack the ability to spend great amounts on this issue. However, isn’t it a PAC that enables them to pool their money together? What is the comparative on your side? * Why are politicians more likely to listen to those that lobby them? This may seem self-evident, but you need to explain how this process works. * The POI is still legitimate - all your harms still exist with donations? * Good use of examples from earlier; why shouldn’t we privilege these opinions, or how is this an abuse? You assume that the negative impact and the weighing of these harms is obvious, but all the actual analysis is missing! For instance, this increases accountability - banning lobbying would increase transparency and make it easier for citizens to understand how and why decisions are made, fostering greater accountability from elected officials. * On lack of transparency - why can’t we regulate against this?   05:01  How many POIs did you ask today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Clear opening, clear explanation of what regulations you’re going to apply from the get-go. I wish you could use an example to highlight how or why this is a crucial mechanism for change. What is unique about lobbying, compared to donations?  Rebuttal   * Good immediate attack on the lack of exclusivity on Prop’s world; explain how just banning lobbying and not doing anything to donations is probably worse; explain why vulnerable people have greater access to lobbying, compared to donations where wealth acts as a barrier to entry.   Argument 1   * From the get-go, the labelling in the argument is confusing - it radicalises the movement? For this argument to be true, you need to explain why their main resort was always going to be or has been lobbying. You need to prove that they have dependence in the first place. * There’s no other mechanism? Really? They can’t vote? They can’t protest? See the POI Jodie asks you - explain how the PAC structure + ability to create visibility is the tipping point. * We talk about lack of regulations, which is good - but flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence. * How does your side achieve change? How do these groups access lobbying, how do they compete against the more conservative lobbyists?   05:19 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Your opening is well identified, but delivered underwhelmingly. There’s no emphasis, no pauses, no performance. Stop saying ‘so proud to propose’ - everything we say has to have a strategic value add. What addition are we making here?  Rebuttals   * Grassroots and donations are all symmetric in the debate. You need to explain why lobbying HURTS these social movements disproportionately to flip the argument. You also need to explain what meaningful distinction between donations and lobbying exist on your side. * Visibility - explain why social movements don’t rely on lobbying for success in the first place. Rather, it is groups that are against this that rely on lobbying. Use an example to illustrate the power asymmetry that exists here, for instance between big oil and the environmentalists. * Don’t take a POI in the middle of a sentence. * Good on it working for the rich. Explain how and why it does prioritise them! The current system favors well-funded lobbyists and corporations, giving them a disproportionate voice in shaping policy. A ban would create a more equitable system where all citizens, regardless of their wealth or connections, have an equal opportunity to be heard. * Are we sure that there is no tie to donations?   Argument 1 - started at 4:46 in a five minute speech. Bad time management!   * There is no way you can run a principle in 15 seconds. * Explain how it limits autonomy, and disturbs the principle of democracy, explaining why equality and fairness is why we value a democratic system in the first place.   05:16  How many POIs did you ask today? | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Have a cleaner opening. Establish why donations are symmetric to the harms of lobbying that they highlighted. Explain why this will still have political ties, but is actually WORSE. Explain how lobbying is easier for the vulnerable to access. We do this eventually by explaining how they can pool together, or work as coalitions. Excellent - deal with this in the first minute, stop and explain how this means their side is not exclusive. Spell out the strategic implication clearly.  On equalising force, this needs to have more analysis, using examples of what social change and movements look like in their world versus yours.  Good call back to your model! Flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence.  Argument 1   * Without telling me the thesis, the two pieces of characterisation are just confusing! You have to spell out what the purpose or point of the argument is first. * The same comment on symmetry with corporations applies here; is it true that Planned Parenthood will have the same amount of money as the NRA, or their anti-abortion equivalent? * How does your side achieve change? How do these groups access lobbying, how do they compete against the more conservative lobbyists?   We are speaking slightly too fast. We need to incorporate emphasis, and spend time packaging - especially when you’re explaining the value of representation.  05:17 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  Excellent opening; the ‘is this a world’ line requires for you to emphasise towards the end of this phrase for the impact to occur. Good on it working for the rich. Explain how and why it does prioritise them! The current system favors well-funded lobbyists and corporations, giving them a disproportionate voice in shaping policy. A ban would create a more equitable system where all citizens, regardless of their wealth or connections, have an equal opportunity to be heard.  What is the structure of your speech? You have to have TWO clashes, rather than having one clash, doing case-by-case comparison?  On the donation clarification - that anonymous sure comes out of nowhere, but is a great strategy to explain why the political tie goes away. Grassroots and donations are all symmetric in the debate. You need to explain why lobbying HURTS these social movements disproportionately to flip the argument.  Excellent on the lack of symmetry between corporations and social movements. POI - good on exclusivity.  Clash 1 - what is it? There has to be a title!   * In a clash, first state their contributions - then rebut them here. You went through most of the responses in your extraneous rebuttals above. This isn’t how a clash should be structured! We’re just summarising our contributions in a symmetric manner. This isn’t a clash in reply! * Explain why social movements don’t rely on lobbying for success in the first place. Rather, it is groups that are against this that rely on lobbying. Use an example to illustrate the power asymmetry that exists here, for instance between big oil and the environmentalists. The comparative comes AFTER five!   The emphasis has increased significantly, but the speed is still too fast. There are also moments where you are just reading off your paper!  05:26  Very cheeky tactic to shout POI to try and get them to take you, but in a competition setting a judge might tell you off for this. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Have a cleaner opening. Establish from the get-go why this an exclusive platform. Annabel explains why this isn’t the mechanism social movements would benefit from, or even use. You have to explain why this isn’t true - otherwise there is no exclusivity to your side.  In signposting, you have to tell me the name of these clashes. Limit extraneous rebuttals as far as possible. Why are we responding speaker by speaker? Since when do we do this at third?  Rebuttal  We aren’t engaging with donations - Annabel explains how this is going to be anonymous; call this out as new content at third. Establish why donations are symmetric to the harms of lobbying that they highlighted. Explain why this will still have political ties, but is actually WORSE. Explain how lobbying is easier for the vulnerable to access. Our rebuttal isn’t reflective of how the debate has shifted in the speech before us.  We have to establish why these social movements use lobbying in the first place! So far, this has been unproven down the bench! On equalising force, this needs to have more analysis, using examples of what social change and movements look like in their world versus yours.  The same comment on symmetry with corporations applies here; is it true that Planned Parenthood will have the same amount of money as the NRA, or their anti-abortion equivalent? How does your side achieve change? How do these groups access lobbying, how do they compete against the more conservative lobbyists?  Flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence.  05:15  We have to have clashes when we speak third! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Have a more useful opening! Establish from the get-go why this an exclusive platform. Annabel explains why this isn’t the mechanism social movements would benefit from, or even use. You have to explain why this isn’t true - otherwise there is no exclusivity to your side. The opening is too critical, without engaging directly!  We have to have STRUCTURE! What will the structure of this speech be? Either use clashes, or say - I’m going to talk about three things - and then label these up top.  On framing - Annabel explains how this is going to be anonymous; call this out as new content at third. Establish why donations are symmetric to the harms of lobbying that they highlighted. Explain why this will still have political ties, but is actually WORSE. Explain how lobbying is easier for the vulnerable to access. Our rebuttal isn’t reflective of how the debate has shifted in the Prop speech before us. If it is anonymous donations, how do they know who is it giving to them and hence what policies or regulations to change?  Is it the only way? We have to establish why these social movements use lobbying in the first place! So far, this has been unproven down the bench! On equalising force, this needs to have more analysis, using examples of what social change and movements look like in their world versus yours.  The same comment on symmetry with corporations applies here; is it true that Planned Parenthood will have the same amount of money as the NRA, or their anti-abortion equivalent? How does your side achieve change? How do these groups access lobbying, how do they compete against the more conservative lobbyists?  Flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence. Good on how it helps voters - flesh this out in greater detail!  02:45 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  I need a cleaner opening; pick ONE issue to beat them on, and focus on that. On exclusivity - this needed to be spelt out more clearly; that these social movements never used lobbying in the first place. Explain why social movements don’t rely on lobbying for success in the first place. Rather, it is groups that are against this that rely on lobbying. Use an example to illustrate the power asymmetry that exists here, for instance between big oil and the environmentalists.  On model - good response! This is delivered slowly, and with clear an upshot on how it hurts their case. We slow down when reminded to, but need to be able to do this ourselves!  We have to have STRUCTURE! What will the structure of this speech be? Either use clashes, or say - I’m going to talk about three things - and then label these up top.  On burdens - you take too much time to set these questions up, even if it were a four minute reply.  Good explanation as to how the current system favors well-funded lobbyists and corporations, giving them a disproportionate voice in shaping policy. A ban would create a more equitable system where all citizens, regardless of their wealth or connections, have an equal opportunity to be heard.  03:13 | | | | | | |