| **Student Name:** Jake Ip |
| --- |

| **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 minutes’ long.]  Interesting hook that there are moral harms and injustices that are also in contention here, it would be good to actively frame why these things do in fact, matter more than the tangible harms though.   * Give the practical implications on the devolution of democratic norms or the loss of checks-and-balances.   Good call-out that Opp didn’t prove how electoral accountability will actively deter abuse, but you also need to give me counter-reasoning as to why it doesn’t work at all!   * Analyse the failures of electoral mechanisms to hold the state accountable:   + They can play the blame game and avert accountability by focusing on the failures of their opponents.   + They can shift the voting issue to something else.   + The hot-button issue in the next 4 years could be radically different. * Or point out that heads of states in their final term cannot be held accountable.   As third, we need to restructure our speech into clashes! The flow is too messy.  The better response to the POI is that all presidents DO pardon their family and friends! Every president in the last few decades in the US has actively done that.  After reinforcing abuse, it isn’t clear why this outweighs the exclusive use of pardons for a positive end.   * We said we would start weighing, but we continue to only focus on the harms of pardons. * On the basis of democratic principles, Opp’s argument is ALSO about democratic principles because it checks for the failures of the courts and the legislative.   + To compare effectively, we have to mitigate Opp’s harms by giving me other pathways to minimise judicial errors.   + Point out legislative slowness and bureaucracy is actually a NETT GOOD for justice and representation.   + We need to have some practical implications of derogating democratic norms, what actually happens on the ground?   Good job offering POIs today, we could offer even more!  5.01 | | | | | | |