| **Student Name:** Hisham Khan |
| --- |

| **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:  We need to start by contextualising what the needs of a society in light of a civil rights movement or protests are; or the way in which these individuals often serve as cults of personality and can inspire awe and prevent scrutiny and accountability.  Set-up   * We need to establish how their fame and history means that they are likely going to have a cult of personality. Explain how this is bad for politics; or explain what the purpose of a politician should be. You could point out how this means they make for good critics, or oppositional figures, as opposed to part of the establishment or within the government. * We need to explain how this debate is about methodology; how do we best achieve change with relevance to civil rights in the long-term. Your side supports oppositional action and protests and mobilisation, as opposed to participating in elections and becoming part of the state.   Argument 1   * Clear thesis - they are solely focused; the push should be that this means they won’t be successful. Explain how aiming for actual success requires compromise, which puts them in a very difficult position. * Explain what it takes to run a successful election campaign; you need to break down systematically how politicians win elections, and why it needs to be a cross coalition of interests. Then explain their role as figurehead, and how this dilution means they lose the point of being this special representative in office. * Go beyond and explain how being in office requires compromise - activists become beholden to party lines and political donors. This can compromise their independence and make them less accountable to the communities they represent. * The push that we’re making here is that if they are solely focused and maintain their ideological purity, they are never getting voted in. If they want to win, then they have to compromise, at which point they alienate all the people who did support them. * POI - is the average civil rights activist MLK? * What is the central claim in this argument? Don’t jump to the impact - explain how you reach this impact first. Characterise what the nature of an activist is, based on what a civil rights protest movement is likely to be - and then explain how this is incompatible with successful politicians. There is no substantive analysis being made in the argument!   Argument 2   * Alienated - is this not an extension of just the first argument? Is this a new claim or thesis? * What is the impact of distrust - does it mean that these issues are far less likely to get mainstream support or buy-in?   What’s the comparative? How does your side achieve change? You need to explain why your counterfactual is far far better, especially on who best helps these minority groups.  06:40 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good call out on victory; but do you want to start by undermining any capacity to win from yours? This is too early to trade off any potential to win the election.  Set-up needs to come prior to rebuttal; a lot of the re-characterisation you do within rebuttals on who these activists are should be dealt with here instead. You need to provide an explanation as to who these activists are, and why they are likely to win elections, and what kind of tactics they are going to employ. You could also argue HERE that the point is not for them to win elections, but to hold politicians accountable on each of these issues; the same analysis we discussed with relevance to single issue parties.  Rebuttals   * What resources? Go into detail! If they lack resources, how are they achieving visibility?   Set-up   * The problem characterisation is missing - how do politicians fall flat of achieving any change? Why are external social movements failing? Why do they have to run for election, or potentially succeed within these elections to achieve any change? We aren’t spending any time on the problem characterisation.   Argument 1   * On prominent groups running - what kinds of groups are these, why do they have a lack of incentive to cater to them? Unpack why politicians only care about existing voting blocs, why they can afford to ignore prominent civil rights movements, or why these voters may be voting on a multiplicity of issues which hence means they cannot express themselves or participate meaningfully. * Majoritarian groups don’t care - good! Explain why they ignore these groups, or never make it their own voting issues. Link this to a lack of change or change being legally enshrined. Give examples of what these issues might be! * Where is the positive explanation of how your side solves this problem? Electoral success provides activists with a larger platform and greater access to media attention. This amplified voice can be used to raise awareness about critical issues and mobilize public support for change. * How do we force other parties to listen? Explain how they see this previously apathetic group as votes up for grabs and hence do focus on these issues; explain how this shift in perception occurs in the eyes of politicians. * The benefits of resources is a jump. How do these activists suddenly have resources? Where do they come from?   06:53 - reach 7! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Start by positioning the opening exchange; you need to make clear what your entry into the debate will be. For instance, OG focuses on how activists will be bad law-makers, and OO focuses on how this leads to visibility for the movement. What we think is that both of them are correct; but we think activists can do more for the movement as oppositional figures.  This is a debate about methodology - how do we best achieve change with relevance to civil rights in the long-term. Your side supports oppositional action and protests and mobilisation, as opposed to participating in elections and becoming part of the state.  You cannot rebut your own opening. This is against the rules and you will be penalised for this. There is no NEED for you to take this action.  On endorsements - why is this sufficient? Why is this better? Why do they work? We say this is the comparative but haven’t provided any positive justification for this.  Never go into the extension without an explanation of how the judge should value this prior to it. The judge doesn’t want to track without any understanding of where the argument is going.  Extension 1   * On characterisation, what is the direction of this? What is the point of establishing they are prominent or visible? Similarly on their cult of personality. These are things Hisham has technically said, but you’re filling the gap in. You need to TELL me this. * Your explanation of how this is going to be less accountable is fine, but insufficient in that the explanation of the comparative is missing. How does your side get more accountability; presumably these activists, without scrutiny, still remain in positions of power - and are still the leaders of these movements, from which change is presumably to occur. * Lobbying is symmetric; it is arguable these impassioned activists are less likely to be corrupted.   Jodie, judges will make faces, look here and there because they are THINKING. You cannot be so responsive to facial expressions, typing or lack of typing etc.  07:04  We need to go watch a few extension speeches so that we understand what the flow of these looks like; look up outrounds from WUDC where the closing teams win/take the 1st or 2nd. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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:  Start by positioning the opening exchange; you need to make clear what your entry into the debate will be. For instance, OG focuses on how activists will be bad law-makers, and OO focuses on how this leads to visibility for the movement. CG comes in and mostly just explains that what OG tries to do, but with more detail. What we think is that….for instance, in this case explain why and how or what details of systematic change are going to exist. The current opening is too vague. You also CANNOT spend 4+ minutes on responses; you need to jump into the extension, and have that be directly responsive to each house. The weighing and why the extension is valuable has to come prior to the actual analysis, so the judge knows what they are tracking and why.  OG:   * Will win; do you want to start by undermining any capacity to win from yours? This is too early to trade off any potential to win the election. Don’t credit Joanne for the response. * You need to provide an explanation as to who these activists are, and why they are likely to win elections, and what kind of tactics they are going to employ. You could also argue HERE that the point is not for them to win elections, but to hold politicians accountable on each of these issues; the same analysis we discussed with relevance to single issue parties. This is all still derivative of OO. We could focus on resources - Joanne was very vague about what these resources are and how these activists can access them.   CG:   * These problems still exist on your side; you don’t think these activists can win - so how do you solve this problem? This becomes an issue later on too, where your extension is contingent on these activists winning. Why and how do they win? * Why is the electoral race the best place for this information campaign + challenges to holding these politicians accountable on these issues? * On competence - you need to explain what leading a civil rights movement requires - and how the skills of a politician are likely to have overlap.   Extension: Why does the average voter start caring? Why are they engaged and politically conscious in the first place? You aren’t explaining how these decade old belief systems suddenly change because there is coverage on television. Why is this coverage impossible to achieve on Gov?  You could run a vertical!   * + Unpack why politicians only care about existing voting blocs, why they can afford to ignore prominent civil rights movements, or why these voters may be voting on a multiplicity of issues which hence means they cannot express themselves or participate meaningfully. Explain why they ignore these groups, or never make it their own voting issues. Link this to a lack of change or change being legally enshrined. Give examples of what these issues might be!   + How do we force other parties to listen? Explain how they see this previously apathetic group as votes up for grabs and hence do focus on these issues; explain how this shift in perception occurs in the eyes of politicians.   07:16 | | | | | | |