| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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: This speech is shorter as the speaker had to leave at 8 sharp.]   * I appreciate the signposting, but signposting can’t be a one size fits all solution for microstructure! * I’m not sure if you want to run the idea that experience doesn’t matter too much in the debate - it was something that your side was really harping on anyway! * Corruption; You need to take into account the other side and what they said about why people won’t leave power if you let them serve for the long term. You gotta deal with this first. * Moreover, you need to make sure that you are comparing the types of corruption that exist on the other side vs the one that exists on your side. You want to make the direct comparison here as to why you are better. * Fair that the case is extreme on the other side, but it is relevant. You probably want to explain that it doesn’t matter whether we have term limits or not if we are truly talking about a dictatorship. * Why is the case that voters can make a good decision regarding the people who are in power? Remember that this is something that the other side disputed quite a bit. You want to make sure that you spend some time dealing with this to explain that there are checks and balances - not just in America, but in general. * I’m not so sure what the relevance of the congressional aspect was. Also, can’t these leaders give guidance to the people who eventually replace them? * Don’t argue through examples! It was very impressive for you to argue about the CCP discipline bureau - but remember the whole world isn’t like that.   Speaking time: 07:32.12, good work! | | | | | | |