| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW create term limits for heads of states. |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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 due to time constraints.]  **Re: Experience**   * Interesting pushback that people have experienced anyway - but I think this is also very convenient. It's not true that most leaders have a ton of experience pre-office. (Look at Imran Khan, Zelensky, Obama.) * I think you want to be careful to not get too caught up with commentary on the other side - fair enough that it wasn’t necessarily the most well built arguments - but they did have some layers for why this is a good idea for stability, etc. Also, this experience angle could have been a bittt more timely, 3 minutes on a single rebuttal wasn’t a good idea.   **Re: Corruption**   * I think it's fair for the Opposition to suggest that you guys were being somewhat extreme here - you may have wanted to go ahead and suggest that these contexts were some of the most important in the debate as these were the most vulnerable areas. * You also want to weigh out the likelihood of corruption here; why is your version of possible corruption better compared to the one that happens in Opposition? You want to really bring back the analysis of how this hurts developing countries the most actually. * I think you need a lot more direction on this issue; how are you winning? Why are you winning? What's the frame that matters the most here? * I think the speech didn’t hit most of the most crucial aspects of the debate. You had to explain the process of power being accumulated, etc.   **Re: Laws**   * Wayyy too late for this clash. It came at 7:46! * I think the most important aspect to deal with for the other side was the idea that you had as much time as possible to introduce laws, vs that you have to rush it.   Speaking time: 8:15, good work! | | | | | | |