| **Student Name:** Ella Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW create term limits for head 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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: Speaking time is 8 minutes today.]   * You have a nice flow and pace with your opening line. It was all good until you said the proud to oppose part.   Framing   * Elections will continue - Fair enough, but I think you want to rebalance this debate a little bit. For instance, they have basically set this debate in the most corrupt and authoritarian ish nations - is that really where you want the debate to happen? You need to explain why the debate shouldn’t be about them either.   Rebuttal   * This is too Putin based - fair enough, but you do need to answer the question from above though re: why it's true that these places shouldn’t be the ones we consider the most in this debate. * Why is the frequency of corruption being increased? What does that increase look like as well? You need to make the comparison when you’re attempting to flip the argument, the reason is because you aren’t comparing corruption and corruption, you’re comparing corruption that happens over the long term (entrenched corruption, selecting people you like.) vs short term corruption (the make a quick buck version you were talking about.) * People will try to do better to be elected - To be fair, doesn’t this apply to the Proposition too? You can still get re-elected + the party can be re-elected too. Why is your incentive that much stronger? * Time management!!!! It’s 5:20!!! Where is the argument??   Argument  1st: High level of democracy   * Your argument: we don’t need to do this because we kinda term limit people by virtue of voting patterns anyway. * This argument is super problematic. The reason is because it feels as though you are **implying** that term limits are actually a good thing. This is because you are saying its good to kick people out after a certain period of time - proposition is gonna win this! They aren’t reliant on electoral wishes, they have a more stable and guaranteed pathway!   2nd: Instability   * Presidents become a lame duck - Fair enough, why wouldn’t they want to finish off the rest of their term on a strong note? Surely the party would hold them to account as well? * Not too sure how relevant the AfD argument was - populism doesn’t just happen due to a leader being in power for too long, it happens for cultural or socio-economic reasons too. Why is this one of the biggest causes?   Speaking time: 08:30.10, nice! | | | | | | |