| **Student Name:** Ethan 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: | 64 | | | | | |
| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  The hook is highlighting the key components of the case which is good for clarity, but there’s no impact nor is it an exercise in case framing, so we should do one or the other.   * Good signposting.   On the set-up:   * Rather than just give an example of how presidential term limits work in the US, actively propose what is the actual term limit you propose.   + We ended up repeating this model after highlighting it in the definition, you can combine both instead of being repetitive. * We should then clarify what is your burden, and push a difficult comparative for Opp to defend, i.e. heads of states staying in for decades at a time.   Where is the case framing today?  On heads of state abusing their power:   * 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. * Your argument cannot just be 30 seconds long! Aim to have 3 reasons why your claim is true, 2 reasons why it’s important and at least 1 comparative analysis.   + We just asserting examples of what they would do. 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?   The second argument on manipulating the electoral process is exactly the same as the first argument.   * Policy stagnation is a completely different argument as the above manipulation, we need to work on compartmentalising the analysis better.   + 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?   Please offer more POIs today!  5.04 - Ethan, I need more effort! You need to earn your spot in PSD III, apply yourself more during prep please. You need to be able to reach 8 minutes when given 25 minutes prep. | | | | | | |