| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that a centralised government is better compared to a government with separate branches of powers |
| --- |

| 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.]  Go even further in your hook, explain why you think efficiency is the most important thing, i.e. without efficiency, none of the benefits of public policy will materialise.  Well done highlighting the flaws of separation of powers due to partisanship in the legislative and the executive.   * Excellent job using Trump’s governance as the grounding, but the use of the example of the ban on trangender people in the military can be flipped against you! This is precisely what proves that the separation of power is needed, and that it was effective in containing executive abuse.   We need a better response against the likelihood of state abuse:   * Point out that the centralised government will also be elected, so checks and balances can still exist if there is an abuse of power. * Then flip it and explain that bad governments can abuse power on either side of the debate.   On your argument of stability:   * We need to link back the inefficiency to one that is exclusively caused by having multiple branches. Explain the nature of one branch making it difficult for the other branch to exercise their powers. * I appreciate the grounding of the use of disasters, and explain why the ease of making decisions is incredibly important for time-sensitive situations.   + Try to draw a picture of the human costs involved. Are we saving lives by making faster decisions?   + Flip the comparative and explain to me why the different branches of government won’t prioritise public interest when it comes to a crisis?   + Faster decision doesn’t always equal better decisions! Analyse the quality of the decisions made as well. * Interesting point about changing governments could be unstable.   + But you are actually proposing a regime by taking away any and all elections!     - This is far more indefensible in the grander scheme of things.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.49 - So close to 6 minutes! Wait for the double bell. | | | | | | |