| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **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 6 to 7 minutes’ long.]  It’s ironic to say that the purpose of democracy is to listen to the people, when your side is eliminating a viable candidate from being voted on to begin with. So you’re not exactly team “choice” here.   * Go back to your case framing here. Can we answer why the protection against erosion of democratic norms is the most important thing in the debate, and would outweigh Opp’s competing ideal of empowering the democratic choice of voters? It needs to address the trade-off of the debate.   + Execution-wise, we’re just saying democracy is the most important here, but the Opposition doesn’t disagree. The question here is WHICH facet of democracy is the most important?   We are reinforcing the potential ways in which power can be abused as the head of state, however, we’re just asserting examples of what they would do, without analysing why they would do this?   * Start with the incentive analysis 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. * Opposition has provided electoral mechanisms and public scrutiny, so try to be comparative to their countermodel, * 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.   + While I understand that the leader can control the streams of information, voters will be able to see that their free political speech is restricted, as well as other dissidents who suffer under those strict controls. Why is this not visible at all?     - Same thing with political opponents being crowded out, why won’t people in this group be able to spread grassroots awareness that they are denied the ability to fairly compete to call on voters to stop voting the incumbent?   Good choice to reinforce that they are likely to be abusive, bad politicians; but Opp has also spent time explaining why these could be trusted leaders who won the re-elections fairly.   * On both sides, it could be a good politician or a bad politician. Which is more likely to be true? Move forward to a likelihood analysis.   We need a stronger principle engagement with Opp’s principle on why voters deserve the right to choose for themselves who is their best representative.  To prove your winning pathway, explain then what are then the resulting harms of eroding democratic norms and institutions beyond just a vague notion of injustice?   * On your impacting, good direction that people may be voting based on a false impression, but it isn’t clear as to why voters would not be able to see through these abusive political behaviours. Is there a reason why voters would still side with these parties to point of a supermajority?   + We need to relate back all of these things to democratic ideals. Explain why it undercuts democratic representation, which is the very purpose of a functioning democracy. Without proper representation, the state has lost their moral legitimacy and their policies do not have the authority to dictate other people’s actions.   The argument overlaps with your first speaker on declining accountability due to the political manipulation of the system.   * 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?   + Can we explain why one type of voting pattern is more likely than the next? Do they lose the logical ability to rationalise the best political option just because someone is a familiar face?   Please offer more POIs today!  6.42 | | | | | | |