| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would create term limits for heads of state |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 6 to 7 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the focal point on harming the democratic norms, but we’re not impacting the importance of this nor how it happens.   * On case framing, interesting attempt that a ban is not outcome-reliant but could also be about structural defence of something important, but it’s almost too generic and not nuanced or contextualised to this motion in particular.   + Can we answer why the protection against erosion of democratic norms is the most important thing in the debate, and would outweigh Opp’s competing ideal of empowering the democratic choice of voters? It needs to address the trade-off of the debate.   + The framing isn’t one and done either, we can absolutely bring this back within our winning argument to demonstrate further how it helped you win this debate.   On the set-up:   * You need to actively propose what is the actual term limit, otherwise I won’t have a clear understanding of how effective this model will be. * We should then clarify what is your burden, and push a difficult comparative for Opp to defend, i.e. heads of states staying in for decades at a time.   Good use of examples on the potential ways in which power can be abused as the head of state, however, we’re just asserting examples of what they would do, without analysing why they would do this?   * Start with the incentive analysis of these heads of states, and why they would undermine democratic institutions as such. * We then need to explain why democratic checks and balances would fail in preventing that. * We also have to analyse why you think voters tend to re-elect these same people in power if they were truly as abusive as you claim.   + While I understand that the leader can control the streams of information, voters will be able to see that their free political speech is restricted, as well as other dissidents who suffer under those strict controls. Why is this not visible at all?     - Same thing with political opponents being crowded out, why won’t people in this group be able to spread grassroots awareness that they are denied the ability to fairly compete to call on voters to stop voting the incumbent? * What are then the resulting harms of eroding democratic norms and institutions beyond just a vague notion of injustice?   + On your impacting, good direction that people may be voting based on a false impression, but it isn’t clear as to why voters would not be able to see through these abusive political behaviours. Is there a reason why voters would still side with these parties to point of a supermajority?     - We need to relate back all of these things to democratic ideals. Explain why it undercuts democratic representation, which is the very purpose of a functioning democracy.   On policy stagnation, why can’t the same politicians evolve their policy platform over time? What are the incentives of leaders to maintain loyalty over their traditional values?   * We need some kind of grounding of what this would look like, and what harms would actively manifest! What are even these policies?   + If the people kept voting for the same people, then wouldn’t it mean that those same policies are actively working and that’s why they were voted in to begin with?   Good job offering POIs today!  6.04 | | | | | | |