| **Student Name:** Gwyneth Chan |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  What change specifically? Let’s be more specific in the opening.  Set-up   * I think we want to say that we think we cannot depend on individuals, rather than sticking to exclusive one good candidate. Good approach, phrasing needs to be clearer. * On characterisation   + Why would they run enticing campaigns, and why would they engage in such ways? Are there no checks and balances against bad politicians? This only engages with the worst case on Opp, rather than being reasonable.   + You can push a burden onto their side - reasonably - and say that they have to defend heads of states staying in for decades at a time.   Argument 1   * Is incumbent advantage the single most powerful determiner of election wins? * We need to first establish why they would be dominant? Why wouldn’t the institutions of the judiciary and legislative hold up or check them? We need to first explain what are the incentives of these heads of states, and why they would undermine democratic institutions as such. * We also have to analyse why you think voters tend to re-elect these same people in power if they were truly as abusive as you claim. * We just asserting examples of what they would do. Why would they do this? * What is the impact of this argument?   + And what are then the resulting harms of eroding democratic norms and institutions?   + What harms are caused to the public? What is the human cost?   Argument 2   * Why would they stay in power if they are bad? Don’t young people at some time age into the middle set that ends up being the big voting power? * Why will the conservatives be in power? Biden still won, Starmer still won? Why can’t the same politicians evolve their policy platform over time? What are the incentives of leaders to maintain loyalty over their traditional values? * We need some kind of grounding of what this would look like, and what harms would actively manifest! What are even these policies? * Fair on future facing - but you say one line about this and then say second will deal with this.   05:07 - we need to work on proving our argument! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Stability - good; what kind of stability? What do you mean by this? On change - don’t say stability matters more but then also say ah but we get this anyways. Pick a clear, simple message up top - and push this instead.  What is our framing? What do we support? Set-up is missing!  Rebuttal   * The rebuttal needs to be more strategic; identify the key claims being made - and then deal with them systematically, rather than offering responses where you can. We need to be more efficient with our responses, especially as 1O. * Good on change existing. Point out how this undermines their claim; they never prove why heads of state would undermine democratic institutions in this way. Link this to voters - why would they continue to vote for someone bad? * POI - clear response. * Progressive change - finite time; look the best. Good! Explain why this is such an important incentive compared to other incentives that may exist. * Good on checks and balances! Don’t go for the most extreme one of impeachment first; start with elections, then link to media scrutiny, opposition scrutiny, the constitution and so forth. * We spent so long verbalising just this one mech, to make it more concise to save time.   Argument 1   * Rather than just saying long term and short term, explain how or why there is a bias to not engage in long term decision making; why do heads of state constantly change their policies? Is it for differentiation, is it because of polarisation, why is this true? * 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. * Explain how policies need time for things to occur, rather than flashy policies which are better for elections. * Impact?   Never start a second argument at 4:50!  04:57 - good first speech! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **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: |  | | | | | |
| 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:  Why are we repeating the motion, why is stagnancy likely to occur? The opening needs more analysis!  Stop and signpost!  Rebuttal   * Fair on changing priorities, but why don’t 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? * Why would they stay in power if they were clearly health wise unwell? Why would voters engage with this? * We need to first explain what are the incentives of these heads of states, and why they would undermine democratic institutions as such. We then need to explain why democratic checks and balances would fail in preventing that. We also have to analyse why you think voters tend to re-elect these same people in power if they were truly as abusive as you claim. * Why would they do this?   + And what are then the resulting harms of eroding democratic norms and institutions?   + What harms are caused to the public? What is the human cost?   Argument   * The same mechanistic questions as above apply; why do voters think in this way, or get used to it? Why are they status quo biassed? * Why can’t the same politicians evolve their policy platform over time? What are the incentives of leaders to maintain loyalty over their traditional values?   + We need some kind of grounding of what this would look like, and what harms would actively manifest! What are even these policies? * If the people kept voting for the same people, then wouldn’t it mean that those same policies are actively working and that’s why they were voted in to begin with?   We need to relax and take it easier! This is just debate class, and isn’t meant to be anxiety-inducing; you’re smart, and it’s all good. We just need to make sure we don’t let the nerves get the best of us! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  I think apathy is a good place to start, but why would apathy go away in your world? If you link this to for instance, really charismatic and good politicians who are once in a generation going away and hence people losing interest, I will probably buy this more.  Rebuttals   * Excellent on the range of checks and balances that exist. 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.   + 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.   Argument 1   * Good example of Biden v Trump - and the kind of election that existed here. Dive deeper and explain why and how this happens; why does this occur more than not. * What did you prove here? What is the impact of this argument?   Argument 2   * Is this the only reason why apathy exists? Or is it because of voter suppression, barriers to entry in terms of time, money, education and such? Is there no other way of solving apathy? * Why will it always be a ‘good’ candidate that gets elected? * Consider this point in greater detail - how does it erode the functions of democracy to remove the best choice available?   + Does it undercut representation and what are then the harms of this?   + Does this undermine goodwill and collaboration with the new elected government? * Good on ageing population - but this came 5:12; should have come up so much earlier!   The analysis in the argument needs more rigour; our structure could also be cleaner. Our style is better today! Good improvement.  05:21 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bella Lent |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Opp explained a few things you need to respond to; that people won’t vote for people that are bad/abusive, and that 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. You need to engage with this, because it disproves the entire case on Prop!  Clash 1: Tyranny   * Why will they get re-elected? Is incumbent advantage the single most powerful determiner of election wins? * Are there no checks and balances against bad politicians? This only engages with the worst case on Opp, rather than being reasonable. * POI - I think the point of the ageing population is that young people become more active as voters… * What did you prove at the end of this clash?   Clash 2   * Opp gives reasons on why scrutiny exists! We need to first establish why they would be dominant? Why wouldn’t the institutions of the judiciary and legislative hold up or check them? We need to first explain what are the incentives of these heads of states, and why they would undermine democratic institutions as such. * These examples are not democratic! Trump did get voted out. * Why will the conservatives be in power? Biden still won, Starmer still won? Why can’t the same politicians evolve their policy platform over time? What are the incentives of leaders to maintain loyalty over their traditional values? * What is the purpose or meaningful benefit of progressivism - explain why first it can’t exist structurally on Opp, and then why your side is able to achieve this. * What did you prove at the end of this clash?   05:13 | | | | | | |