Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PREPARING A PERSUASIVE MUN SPEECH**

English Class Due Dates:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment****Due Date** | **Point Value****(175 total)** | **10A** | **10B** |
| **Read and annotat p.1-10**  | 10 | Thursday 10/27 | Wednesday 10/26 |
| **Outline of speech in packet** | 20 | Monday 10/31 | Monday 10/31 |
| **Typed rough draft of speech** | 20 | Friday 11/4 | Thursday 11/3 |
| **Peer editing** | 10 | Friday 11/4 (in class) | Thursday 11/3 (in class) |
| **Speeches!** | 100 | Thursday11/10 Friday 11/11 | Wednesday11/9 Thursday 11/10 |
| **Reflection** | 15 | Monday 11/21 | Monday 11/21 |
| **ATTACH ROUGH DRAFT, FINAL DRAFT, AND REFLECTION TO THIS PACKET. HAND EVERYTHING IN TOGETHER.**  | 10 (for all items handed in on time) | Monday 11/21 | Monday 11/21 |

Following the writing of a resolution, the student should prepare speeches. Planned speeches are often the most effective because they can make full use of rhetoric. They can also be recycled in debate as a talking point. In MUN, speaking “off the cuff” is necessary, especially during points of information, but this is much easier with some talking points to guide delegates on certain issues.

 It is recommended to write out a speech in full ahead of time and memorize it, but it is not recommended to read a speech word for word (in reading, speeches can become monotonous and delivery is harmed).

The objective of a speech is to persuade and even convince others, not merely to state an opinion. In some cases, a nation’s policy may place a student in a position where he must defend the indefensible and cannot be expected to persuade a majority to support him. In preparing speeches, students must be aware not only of their strengths and weaknesses, but also be aware of the points to be made by others. It is often wise to pre-empt certain counter-arguments by answering them in your speech. Overall, it is advisable to list arguments and counter-arguments so that the delegates will be prepared to defend their views as well as make proposals.

Remember: a speech is heard only once and, therefore, needs to leave a strong impression. The audience will remember the important parts of a speech, those short, clear sound-bytes that crystallize an idea. A speech that is short, clear and well structured will be much more effective than a long, confusing, and rambling one. The key elements to an effective speech include the following:

1. The most important points are arranged in ascending order with the final point a climax.
2. Numbering the points is helpful to the speaker in delivering the speech and to the audience in remembering it.
3. Use a key word or phrase for each argument and repeat the main points before yielding the floor.

The advanced speaker has taken the next steps in preparing his techniques in delivery. Besides building repetitions, using catch phrases and rhetorical pauses, he has worked out his stance (firm, dogmatic, ironic, conciliatory, etc.), the image he wants to project (idealistic, revolutionary, moderate, etc.), and the appropriate level of language needed for the role he is assuming. The MUN Directors and caucus leaders can often help in the selection of appropriate terminology, phraseology and vocabulary as delegates prepare speeches in the classroom.

Speakers should deliver their speeches in a clear, loud voice. Every speech should have an obvious beginning, e.g. “Madame Chairwoman, ladies and gentlemen, the delegate is in favor of this resolution because…..”, followed by arguments that are to the point, and an obvious ending, e.g. “Therefore, I urge the House to vote in favor of this resolution. I will now yield to points of information.” Points of information must be phrased in the form of a question, but that does not imply that they are used to elicit information from the speaker. In many cases, they are used rhetorically in order to express an opinion when one does not have the floor or to support or disconcert the speaker who does have the floor, e.g. “Does the speaker not agree with me that the recent strike against unarmed civilians in Iraq can only be regarded as murder?”

The speaker who has the floor should not allow himself to be put off by points of information. He can, however, take the opportunity to reply to the question in any way he chooses either re-emphasizing his earlier points earlier or using the question as a springboard to launch into another argument. Points of information should never be answered by a simple “yes” or “no” which would be a wasted opportunity. It is during this stage of answering points of information that the debate is the liveliest, so students should be encouraged to answer points which arise and not simply yield the floor after delivering their prepared speech.

**USING RHETORICAL STRATEGIES FOR PERSUASION**

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/588/04/

There are three types of **rhetorical appeals, or persuasive strategies,** used in arguments to support claims and respond to opposing arguments. A good argument will generally use a combination of all three appeals to make its case.

**Logos**

Logos or the appeal to reason relies on logic or reason. Logos often depends on the use of inductive or deductive reasoning.

Inductive reasoning takes a specific representative case or facts and then draws generalizations or conclusions from them. Inductive reasoning must be based on a sufficient amount of reliable evidence. In other words, the facts you draw on must fairly represent the larger situation or population. Example:

Fair trade agreements have raised the quality of life for coffee producers, so fair trade agreements could be used to help other farmers as well.

In this example the specific case of fair trade agreements with coffee producers is being used as the starting point for the claim. Because these agreements have worked the author concludes that it could work for other farmers as well.

Deductive reasoning begins with a generalization and then applies it to a specific case. The generalization you start with must have been based on a sufficient amount of reliable evidence.Example:

Genetically modified seeds have caused poverty, hunger, and a decline in bio-diversity everywhere they have been introduced, so there is no reason the same thing will not occur when genetically modified corn seeds are introduced in Mexico.

In this example the author starts with a large claim, that genetically modified seeds have been problematic everywhere, and from this draws the more localized or specific conclusion that Mexico will be affected in the same way.

**Avoid Logical Fallacies**

These are some common errors in reasoning that will undermine the logic of your argument. Also, watch out for these slips in other people's arguments.

**Slippery slope:** This is a conclusion based on the premise that if A happens, then eventually through a series of small steps, through B, C,..., X, Y, Z will happen, too, basically equating A and Z. So, if we don't want Z to occur A must not be allowed to occur either. Example:

If we ban Hummers because they are bad for the environment eventually the government will ban all cars, so we should not ban Hummers.

In this example the author is equating banning Hummers with banning all cars, which is not the same thing.

**Hasty Generalization:** This is a conclusion based on insufficient or biased evidence. In other words, you are rushing to a conclusion before you have all the relevant facts. Example:

Even though it's only the first day, I can tell this is going to be a boring course.

In this example the author is basing their evaluation of the entire course on only one class, and on the first day which is notoriously boring and full of housekeeping tasks for most courses. To make a fair and reasonable evaluation the author must attend several classes, and possibly even examine the textbook, talk to the professor, or talk to others who have previously finished the course in order to have sufficient evidence to base a conclusion on.

**Post hoc ergo propter hoc:** This is a conclusion that assumes that if 'A' occurred after 'B' then 'B' must have caused 'A.' Example:

I drank bottled water and now I am sick, so the water must have made me sick.

In this example the author assumes that if one event chronologically follows another the first event must have caused the second. But the illness could have been caused by the burrito the night before, a flu bug that had been working on the body for days, or a chemical spill across campus. There is no reason, without more evidence, to assume the water caused the person to be sick.

**Genetic Fallacy:** A conclusion is based on an argument that the origins of a person, idea, institute, or theory determine its character, nature, or worth. Example:

The Volkswagen Beetle is an evil car because it was originally designed by Hitler's army.

In this example the author is equating the character of a car with the character of the people who built the car.

**Begging the Claim:** The conclusion that the writer should prove is validated within the claim. Example:

Filthy and polluting coal should be banned.

Arguing that coal pollutes the earth and thus should be banned would be logical. But the very conclusion that should be proved, that coal causes enough pollution to warrant banning its use, is already assumed in the claim by referring to it as "filthy and polluting."

**Circular Argument:** This restates the argument rather than actually proving it. Example:

George Bush is a good communicator because he speaks effectively.

In this example the conclusion that Bush is a "good communicator" and the evidence used to prove it "he speaks effectively" are basically the same idea. Specific evidence such as using everyday language, breaking down complex problems, or illustrating his points with humorous stories would be needed to prove either half of the sentence.

**Either/or:** This is a conclusion that oversimplifies the argument by reducing it to only two sides or choices. Example:

We can either stop using cars or destroy the earth.

In this example where two choices are presented as the only options, yet the author ignores a range of choices in between such as developing cleaner technology, car sharing systems for necessities and emergencies, or better community planning to discourage daily driving.

**Ad hominem:** This is an attack on the character of a person rather than their opinions or arguments. Example:

Green Peace's strategies aren't effective because they are all dirty, lazy hippies.

In this example the author doesn't even name particular strategies Green Peace has suggested, much less evaluate those strategies on their merits. Instead, the author attacks the characters of the individuals in the group.

**Ad populum:** This is an emotional appeal that speaks to positive (such as patriotism, religion, democracy) or negative (such as terrorism or fascism) concepts rather than the real issue at hand. Example:

If you were a true American you would support the rights of people to choose whatever vehicle they want.

In this example the author equates being a "true American," a concept that people want to be associated with, particularly in a time of war, with allowing people to buy any vehicle they want even though there is no inherent connection between the two.

**Red Herring:** This is a diversionary tactic that avoids the key issues, often by avoiding opposing arguments rather than addressing them. Example:

The level of mercury in seafood may be unsafe, but what will fishers do to support their families.

In this example the author switches the discussion away from the safety of the food and talks instead about an economic issue, the livelihood of those catching fish. While one issue may effect the other, it does not mean we should ignore possible safety issues because of possible economic consequences to a few individuals.

**Ethos**

Ethos or the ethical appeal is based on the character, credibility, or reliability of the writer. There are many ways to establish good character and credibility as an author:

* Use only credible, reliable sources to build your argument and cite those sources properly.
* Respect the reader by stating the opposing position accurately.
* Establish common ground with your audience. Most of the time, this can be done by acknowledging values and beliefs shared by those on both sides of the argument.
* If appropriate for the assignment, disclose why you are interested in this topic or what personal experiences you have had with the topic.
* Organize your argument in a logical, easy to follow manner. You can use the Toulmin method of logic or a simple pattern such as chronological order, most general to most detailed example, earliest to most recent example, etc.
* Proofread the argument. Too many careless grammar mistakes cast doubt on your character as a writer.

**Pathos**

Pathos, or emotional appeal, appeals to an audience's needs, values, and emotional sensibilities.

Argument emphasizes reason, but used properly there is often a place for emotion as well. Emotional appeals can use sources such as interviews and individual stories to paint a more legitimate and moving picture of reality or illuminate the truth. For example, telling the story of a single child who has been abused may make for a more persuasive argument than simply the number of children abused each year because it would give a human face to the numbers.

Only use an emotional appeal if it truly supports the claim you are making, not as a way to distract from the real issues of debate. An argument should never use emotion to misrepresent the topic or frighten people.

**Read and annotate the following speeches. Comment on structure, rhetorical strategies, fallacies, transition language, analysis, supporting evidence, effectiveness, etc.**

**Sample Speech #1**

Country: Federative Republic of Brazil

Topic: Internationalization of the Amazon

 It upholds 50% of the world’s biodiversity, 20% of the world’s drinking water, 20% of the world’s oxygen, 3,000 fish species, 950 types of birds, 1,5 million catalogued plant species: The Amazon Rainforest.

That immense rainforest in South America with lots of green and innumerable kinds of plants and animals. A beautiful and rich place that you’ve got to visit at least once in your lifetime. But do you really know what’s going on in the Amazon? [Pause]

 Between May 2000 and May 2005, the Amazon lost more than 132,000 km2 of forest, an area larger than Greece! With this rate of deforestation, the Amazon would have been reduced to 40% in twenty years. We can’t let it happen. The destruction of the Amazon would mean not only a great territorial loss to the world, but the extinction of species and even a significant acceleration of the global warming process due to the huge amounts of CO2 that would be released.

 The Amazon Rainforest is divided among nine countries, being Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Guyana, Suriname, and French Guiana, but the concern for it should come from all of the countries in the world. The conservation of the Amazon would benefit the well being of the whole international community and not only the countries that govern it.

But while Brazil and the eight other nations that possess portions of the Amazon present feasible solutions to the question of the deforestation, a taunting threat is presented by other nations, [pause] the internationalization of the Amazon. Surprising remarks, such as the one stated by the United States’ former Vice President, Al Gore, that, “Contrary to what the Brazilian people think the Amazon is not theirs, it is of all of us,” demonstrate how outrageous and irrational this desire is. These countries led by the United States and the United Kingdom claim that they are the ones who know what’s best for the rainforest, what a typical posture of them. But as president Lula da Silva stated, “It’s amusing to hear countries among the world’s worst polluters talk about the preservation of the Amazon.” What morality do they have to say that the Brazilian government isn’t efficient when it comes to the protection of OUR rainforest? They are the same countries that have destroyed almost all of their natural beauties only to open space to big metropolis so that their economies could boost.

The biased foundation of the internationalization already serves to show how the whole idea is not based on facts and that there may be other purposes rather than just ecological ones. And as stated by the Brazilian Minister of Justice, Tarso Genro, “this claim hides the economic interests over the Amazon as a reserve for the planetary multinational corporations for the territory control of other states over Brazil.”

 The internationalization is also a clear infringement of the sovereign rights of the nine nations that control the Amazon, since it would mean that other countries would be able to intervene in the jurisdiction of a national territory. If ecology is really the main concern, then there are alternative solutions that wouldn’t go against UN principles.

To prove these countries wrong, Brazil and the other Latin American countries have in fact been efficient in the combat of deforestation. Since 2002 the conserved lands in the Amazon have almost tripled and deforestation rates have dropped up to 40%. Brazil has been able to decrease its deforestation rates every year. In 2005, 19,000 km2 of forest were deforested, in 2007 the number decreased to 11,000 and in 2009 the number was at 9,000. At this rate, Brazil plans on reaching 5,000 km2 in the next two years. These statistics serve to prove how committed the Brazilian government has been with the conservation of its rainforest.

With the inflammatory claim of internationalization in mind, the Brazilian government has presented pragmatic solutions that actually aim the preservation. It has created extensive national programs for preservation and also joint programs with the UNEP, United Nations Environment Programme, and countries such as the United States and China; all of them with the concern of saving the Amazon. And now the Brazilian delegation presents a resolution to the Security Council in which four main things are accomplished. First, the economical participation of the international community in the conservation of the rainforest, second the necessary steps in the creation of a sustainable development of the Amazon that doesn’t jeopardize the use of the environment by future generations. Third, the creation of stricter laws for illegal activities in the Amazon and last, but not least, the certification of the transparency of projects implemented by the Brazilian government.

Well, to sum it up, the irrational idea of internationalization created by countries wishing to prosper from the Brazilian resources, has no strong arguments and is filled with flaws that would compromise its full accomplishment. It infringes sovereignty, clearly has other purposes than just ecological ones and is led by countries that haven’t been able to protect their own nature. There is no way any nation here present would be able to agree with such imperfect idea.

 The Brazilian resolution presents plausible and well-thought solutions to the deforestation issues. Solutions that only take into account what would be best for the rainforest and not for the economy of certain nations. Solutions that maintain the Amazon under the jurisdiction of its rightful owners. The Security Council has a chance to take the first step towards the planning of a better future and help the Latin American countries to take care of their rainforest, now don’t get me wrong, helping with the consent of these nations because WE are the owners of the Amazon. Therefore, the delegate urges the House to vote in favor of this resolution. The delegate is now open to points of information.

**Sample Speech #2**

Country: Iran

Topic: Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

I come here representing a nation of peace. Iran is struggling right now. We are struggling because this Council has imposed on us sanctions, sanctions that hurt our nation with no purpose other than concealing other secret agendas. And what do we mean, by this? Simple. We’ve heard the side comments. Radicals, ignorant, undiplomatic. We are here to say that Iran is NOT this. Our country is a nation protected under Allah. It is a nation that abides by Allah, therefore it is a pure nation. It is a nation that believes in Allah, subsequently we believe in righteous peace, meaning we are completely against nuclear weaponry or anything of this sort. Before any other procedures, delegates, rest assured – our nuclear program has no secret agenda to it.

 Article IV of the NPT recognizes the inalienable rights of all the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We will stand by our rights.

We have heard claims that the Qom Enrichment Plant is not following IAEA accords. However, as of this year of 2010, the results of the environmental samples taken at PFEP indicate that the maximum enrichment level in the DIQ had not been exceeded at that plant. AND, even though some have claimed that Qom Fuel Enrichment Plant had not been communicated to the IAEA, In September 2009, Iran informed the Agency that it was constructing the Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant (FFEP), located near the city of Qom. The Agency verified that FFEP was being built. But now we are facing the accusation of non-compliance.

Now, I ask, delegates – non-compliance? Iran was forced to resort to minor secrecy after US pressure caused several of its nuclear contracts with foreign governments to fall through; but that was a long time ago and today we are transparent. Iran has effectuated the Additional Protocol of the Iranian Safeguards Agreement, as required by the IAEA in its various government reports.

We find such sanctios already in action and further ones proposed absolutely ABSURD. Furthermore, Iran is extremely concerned with the potential monopolization of nuclear fuel production. We ALL know that such monopolizations directly lead to over abuse of power and military threats. Need I remind this council of the occasions in which this abuse happened? I think not.

 LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, our enriched uranium is less than 5%, consistent with fuel for a civilian nuclear power plant. We stand by our rights. We want nuclear energy because we have an increasing demand for energy! We don’t want to keep burning fossil fuels. We want nuclear energy because we need the radioactive isotopes for medical purposes! So now, because we want nuclear technology to SAVE OUR PEOPLE we suffer sanctions and prejudice, while other nations who are KNOWN to have nuclear bombs with the power to annihilate this WORLD, those other nations are offered your protection and pity. Don’t pity them. Pity the true sufferers, pity the ones that to this day still have to battle for their rights. God! If we denied a hospital in YOUR countries the right to process medical radioisotopes for pharmaceutical use, you’d declare war on us!

 The nuclear processing facilities at Qom and Furdow, which you accuse of developing weapons of mass destruction, are simply there to provide materials for the Tehran Research Reactor. And our cyclotrons are only kept isolated because Israel has threatened to bomb our reprocessing facilities, and if those medical radioisotopes that we protect aren’t available because they could destroy it, people at the Tehran hospitals will DIE. All we are trying to do is prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. And yet, you still accuse us.

 I smell prejudice in this. I still smell that long believing stance in which Muslims are connected to destruction. PLEASE! Aren’t we past this? We are talking about CIVILIANS, about NATIONS, about DIPLOMACY, about HUMAN BEINGS! You should all be ashamed of yourselves, for letting such atrocities be committed against our country. It’s all a plot to cover the true violators. I need not to point fingers. At this moment, all of you will look at the one country we KNOW is lying to us about their program. Iran looks at you too. And Iran reminds you that God will be our final judge.

 We are not scared to enter this round of agreements because we know we are right. We have nothing to hide. Search our facilities! We allow it. Question our program! We will answer you. But don’t forget – we have already let it happen several times, and you still have the courage to say we haven’t. Non-compliance is now just a banal term. We don’t deserve these sanctions. We don’t deserve your mistrust.

Together, we can do this. Together, we can stand by a country’s right. Together, we can fight prejudice. Together, we can fight oppression. This is why I urge you to support this resolution. The delegate is now open to points of information.

MUN Persuasive Speech  Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 OUTLINE OF SPEECH Country \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Introduction**
	1. Hook:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
	2. Background Information:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* 1. Outline of main points: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* 1. Proposition: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

1. **Body Paragraphs:** Below, list the most important points arranged in ascending order with the final point as a natural climax. Include counter arguments in anticipation of later debate and defense. Numbering the points is helpful to the speaker in delivering the speech and to the audience in remembering it. Use a key word or phrase for each argument and repeat the main points before yielding the floor.
	1. Topic sentence with main idea:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**
		1. Supporting evidence: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* + 1. Commentary/Analysis:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
	1. Topic sentence with main idea:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**
		1. Supporting evidence: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* + 1. Commentary/Analysis:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
	1. Topic sentence with main idea:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**
		1. Supporting evidence: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* + 1. Commentary/Analysis:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
	1. Topic sentence with main idea:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**
		1. Supporting evidence: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* + 1. Commentary/Analysis:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
1. **Conclusion:**
	1. Restate proposition:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* 1. Summarize main ideas/points: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* 1. Powerful clincher that leaves a lasting impression on the audience: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Model UN Persuasive Speech Name of author\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Peer Editing Rubric/Form Name of Peer Editor\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Introduction**

1. What hook does the author use? Why or why isn’t it effective? Offer an alternative approach.
2. Is the proposition stated clearly and early? State the purpose of the speech here? If it is not obvious, make a suggestion to make it apparent.
3. What are the author’s main points to support his/her argument? Are they clearly stated?
4. Is the speech’s framework (organization) made clear here? i.e. Is it clear to the audience how the speech will proceed and the argument will proceed?

**Body**

1. What organizational strategy (or strategies) did the author use? Is this the most effective one(s) for his/her topic? Why/why or not? Make a suggestion for a different approach that might be more effective.
2. Does this organizational strategy make the main points of the essay clear and easy to understand after only hearing the speech once? Why or why not?
3. Is there enough evidence to support the author’s proposition? Offer a suggestion or two that might help with this.

**Conclusion**

1. Are all the ideas of the speech tied together in the conclusion? List/discuss ways the author could tie things together better or make his/her conclusion more clear.
2. Does the author revisit his/her proposition in a way that leaves a strong and lasting impression on the listener? Offer a suggestion or two to improve this.

**General**

1. Is the speech coherent/cohesive? i.e. Does it flow smoothly and logically from one idea to the next? Is it focused on one main idea or does it digress and drift away from the main point? List any cuts that you feel need to be made as well as any suggestions you have to improve the flow.
2. Does the author counter-arguments and answer them appropriately? Offer a suggestion to improve this aspect.
3. Does the speech provide a thoughtful and thorough analysis of the subject which convinces the reader/listener of his/her proposition? List a suggestion or two that could improve this aspect of the speech.
4. Did the author use transitions between ideas? What strategies did he/she use (i.e. numbering points, transitional expressions)? Offer suggestions to improver the transitions here.
5. Are there any fallacies of thinking in this essay? (if you are not familiar with these, please see pages 245-6 in this packet). List any fallacies and suggestion for how to improve them.
6. Is the speech grammatically correct? Mark any grammatical errors you find on his/her paper.
7. Are all of the words in the speech used appropriately? Find at least two that could be used better and mark them on the paper.
8. What is something that the author did particularly well?
9. List any other suggestion you have for the author to improve this speech (either from last year’s video or from your own brilliant mind).

MUN Persuasive Speech Rubric Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Country \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PRESENTATION** (35 POINTS)

\_\_\_\_ (7) Eye contact: with the whole audience, not the teacher

\_\_\_\_ (5) Proper Use of Notecards/Manuscript: memorized opening, NO Reading

\_\_\_\_ (10) Voice: volume/rate/enunciation/fluency/use of pauses

\_\_\_\_ (8) Posture/Gesture: posture/appropriate use of hands/no distracting movements

\_\_\_\_ (5) Overall Impressions: polished, prepared and rehearsed

\_\_\_\_ (up to 20 off) Reading directly from notes

**CONTENT** (65 Points)

\_\_\_\_ (10) Effective Introduction: attention grabber/states proposition/outlines main points

\_\_\_\_ (5) Effective Conclusion: strong impression left/revisited proposition/ ideas tied together/ summed up

\_\_\_\_ (30) Effective identification and solution to problem: appropriate use of facts/ anticipation of counterarguments/thorough analysis

\_\_\_\_ (10) Smooth, logical flow between ideas/transition/numbering ideas, etc

\_\_\_\_ (10) Powerful word choice: anaphora/metaphor/innovative word choice/ appropriate grammar

\_\_\_\_ Time violation (up to 20 off for too little or too much time)

\_\_\_\_ Bonus for especially well: well crafted emotional appeals/ “Wow! Factor”

Reflection on Speech

What are you proud of yourself for doing well? (It can be anything related to writing or delivering speech.)

In writing your speech, do you feel like you dedicated sufficient time to writing your persuasive speech? If not what was the reason?

What past of speech was easiest and most difficult to write? Why is this?

What would you like your English and/or social studies teacher to do next year to help you develop your speech writing/making process develop more?

How much time did you dedicate to practicing your speech before delivery? Do you feel that this was an adequate amount of time? What were your biggest challenges?

Did you feel nervous before or during your speech? Analyze what makes you feel nervous. What can you/we do to help reduce this anxiety?

If you could do your speech again (and you will, in MUN ☺) what would you do differently?

Did you feel like you captured your audience? How did you do so? If not, what was lacking?

**TOTAL:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment****Due Date** | **Points** | **Point Value****(175 total)** | **Comments** |
| **p.1-5 read and annotated** |  | 10 |  |
| **Outline of speech in packet** |  | 20 |  |
| **Typed rough draft of speech** |  | 20 |  |
| **Peer editing** |  | 10 |  |
| **Speeches!** |  | 100 |  |
| **Reflection** |  | 15 |  |
| **ATTACH ROUGH DRAFT, FINAL DRAFT, AND REFLECTION TO THIS PACKET. HAND EVERYTHING IN TOGETHER.**  |  | 10 (for all items handed in on time) |  |

**Total: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/175**