| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THW implement 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: | 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 minutes’ long.]   * Nice framing and opening line at the beginning. I’m not so sure if its a good idea to make the focus of the opening line about North Korea though.   **Context**   * You probably want to explain what this policy would look like in the context of creating; give me a few situations that this policy could work on. * People spend lots of time in power in congress, etc, before they become a head of a state. Fair, but this isn’t really for a lot of politicians though. Especially in today's era, for example, Obama was only a senator for like 4 years before becoming President. My point is, you want to not pigeon hole you explanation to one specific type of person.   **1st: How does this harm democracy?**   * I’m not sure why it’s true that people can entrench themselves in power. You need to give me some framing here; what kind of countries are we talking about here? Are these countries like developing countries? What’s the context there? (i.e., there are weak law enforcement and institutions, etc.) * I’m not sure if you want to make this debate one that happens in a very problematic democracy (like Russia.) the reason for this is because this assumes that absolute worst case of your opponents - your argument of different ideologies would have been richer if you had taken this into account. For example, even if you are consistently elected, you can still have very very robust ideological debates. (Look at the UK for example.)   **2nd: Corruption**   * This is pretty similar to the first argument. I think you may have done well to just combine the two together, because corruption hurts democracy anyway. * You want to explain how exactly it is the case that people get to elect people to political positions - e.g.. Supreme Court Justices if they stay in power for too long. * You also want to explain how a long term version of corruption is worse than one that happens in the short term; it’s likely to happen in both worlds. You must tell me why its worse! * I’m not sure why there won’t be any long term development etc.   **3rd: Stability**   * Good argument re: people will revolt. Once again though, you want to take a frame here that takes out the most basic questions of the Opposition - like how leaders can be thrown out of power if they are unpopular etc.   Speaking time: 08:22.24, great work! | | | | | | |