| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that countries should spend rather than save during a debt crisis |
| --- |

| 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 minutes’ long.]  Nice use of grounding at the very beginning as a good set of perspective by stating that stimulus solved South Korea’s problem, but it wasn’t clear here that Korea was actually suffering from a debt crisis.  On spending being the exact solution, we need to engage with Opp’s recharacterisation that the state likely won’t have significant revenue streams to implement any meaningful stimulus programs to begin with.   * They then said that you’d have to borrow more which worsens the debt crisis.   + So we have to explain why the stimulus programs would have immediate short-term gains, which would disrupt Opp’s claim on the interest rate snowballing.     - Point out that if we are earning more, it’s okay to have more debt because we are improving the debt-to-GDP ratio.   We are not engaging with any of Opp’s arguments on deteriorating market confidence and capital flight, as well as whether the state would be efficient/corrupt in its implementation.  On the first argument:   * Interesting point on improving public services, but we’re not directly relating this back to the context of a debt crisis. It seems like we’re arguing its benefits in a vacuum,   + It isn’t clear why investors particularly care about its quality or accessibility when we’re dealing with an economy that’s not making any money. * When we mentioned lowering business costs, spend more time here mechanising why this stimulus plan will reverse the recessionary growth cycle!   + We briefly mentioned stronger returns of investments, how so in a debt crisis?   + it would be better if we set up all the different varieties of stimulus plan here and then expand this claim structurally, i.e. increase in demand, increase in supply, increase in jobs; then mechanise each part via your policy proposal.   + Spend more time explaining the recessionary cycle which leads to long-term cycles, which brings us to a debt crisis we are currently in; and flip it as to why the above actively reverses said recessionary cycle.     - Especially good focus on destroying investor confidence as well as ensuring that consumers will continue to spend money on the economy. We mentioned it very briefly!     - We need to then expand the impacts to real-life harms suffered by the consumers.   + On solving the economic crisis, add a framing here to explain why if we do not get out of the debt crisis, there is long-term harm to the economy that makes it impossible to recover from.     - The final end harm needs to be the nation actually defaulting.   Your clear winning pathway at this point should have been the human costs since Opp offered no engagement here.   * So, we should focus on specific austerity policies that will deny civilians access to public services and their human rights.   + Then we illustrate clearly the human costs of this.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.07 - Good timing. | | | | | | |