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

| **Motion:** This house will abolish the powers of executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Interesting push that we don’t ban things just because of the existence of harms, we can still prevent those harms.   * The better strategic conclusion here is that Prop needs to prove meeting a certain METRIC of harm which they didn’t prove.   + Since the harms could happen in many other ways, but the benefits of pardons are entirely unique, thus it must exist.   Excellent response on alternative forms of accountability!   * But we are stopping too early with backlash, we need to explain how effective or acute the backlash would be.   + We need to deal with the scenario of presidential term limits where electoral accountability is no longer a possibility. * We have to phrase ALL of this as the counter set-up instead!   + Give me a burden/winning pathway.   While they are not causing more material harm, creating injustice and lowering accountability for criminals are still harms that may lead to others committing more offences.  We barely spent any time on the first argument!   * What is the grounding of flawed legislation and why is it so difficult to spearhead reforms?   + There is no impact analysis at all in terms of the human costs.   Good framing that pardons itself are the check and balance to judicial failure.   * It’s not clear WHY the courts are prone to such massive failures. * We need to reframe these criminals to victims of circumstances, what are situations where this is likely to happen?   + Again, it’s unclear what are the human costs or the moral impact of the injustice of this argument would be,   Please offer more POIs today!  5.03 | | | | | | |