| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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 8 minutes’ long.]  Good clarity in the hook.  Audrey, you don’t need to re-define as the 1st Opposition speaker.   * Good job highlighting elections itself as a check-and-balance, we need to pile on even more mechs.   + Media scrutiny and opposition scrutiny would intensify over time if these leaders are not doing well.   + There are constitutions that prevent the erosion of democratic practices.     - So when the leaders are re-elected, it’s because their policies work!   + We spent so long verbalising just this one mech, make it more concise to save time. * Where is the case framing? We’re highlighting democratic choice as your winning pathway, but WHY is it the most important thing in the debate?   We mentioned that there are other laws to prevent abuse of power, but what are they?   * We cannot just say they exist, we need to ground it and mechanise precisely how fool-proof these mechanisms are to protect democracy against bad leaders.   On the lack of policy innovation, while I appreciate the call-out that Prop did not analyse this, you also need to counter the claim with your own analysis!   * Explain to me why politicians have an active incentive to evolve their platform every time in order to garner more votes, or to reach to the grievances of the people.   On democratic choice, there was no principle analysis on the importance of the choice of people being respected!   * How does it erode the functions of democracy to remove the best choice available?   + Does this ruin participation rate?   + Does it undercut representation and what are then the harms of this?   + Does this undermine goodwill and collaboration with the new elected government?   Good analysis on limited accountability for expiring terms, however, why doesn’t the accountability translate to the parties that they are representing?   * The grounding could’ve been better. Focus on individual EXECUTIVE action instead, because LEGISLATIVE action reflects the parties they are from.   + E.g. All US Presidents pardon their friends and families on their last day of office. * Bear in mind that Prop allows for double 4-year terms, so 8 years is pretty long-term to counter your analysis!   Please offer more POIs today!  8.30 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |