| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulous |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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: Today’s speeches are 6 to 7 minutes’ long.]  If politicians will only aim for vague, long-term issues with no real short-term benefits, it isn’t clear why this would be good enough for voters! Why would there be no political competition that politicians with pie-in-the-sky policies will get away with these campaign strategies?   * We should still also engage with Opp’s claims that some policies require longer than a few terms for policy benefits to manifest.   + Explain why their political successors can just carry on their political legacy and continue the long-term policy battle.   Go back to your case framing when you say that it matters when things harm democracy. 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 need a stronger principle engagement with Opp’s principle and explain when has democratic structures limited the choices of voters when we know those choices are harmful, i.e. we don’t allow criminals or foreigners to run for office.   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 and they are the most capable candidate possible..   * 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.   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 policy stagnation, 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? * 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.40 | | | | | | |