| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will pay teachers according to their performance |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are between 6 to 7 minutes’ long!]  I like the hook and your style has improved, Ethan! You sound more fluent and confident than usual.   * But remember that the best hook maximises the impact!   Remember that signposting and counter set-up comes before rebuttals.   * Well done on the counter-model!   + Very clear counterfactual on using the metrics of labour and expertise for pay.   + Good job on the caveat of a performance improvement plan for low-performing teachers.   + Also well done on alternative incentives for teachers to teach better in Opp’s world.   Good job pointing out that Opp is co-opting certain parts of what they propose.  Good rebuttal by highlighting specific contexts where teachers are punished as students have lower grades for reasons outside of their control.   * Spend more time analysing why exactly that overburdened schools often leads to low educational attainment for those students. * Impact this rebuttal a lot more to showcase why unfairness is important.   On the first argument:   * Be mindful that a lot of this analysis has already been said in rebuttals. * Good analysis on inequitable starting points for many educational climates, and how the policy does not compensate teachers fairly. * We need to spend more time on the impact of demotivating teachers or to push high-quality teachers AWAY from some of these difficult schools, thus making it so that schools who need better teachers actually never get the kind of human resources they need!   + This will then further the cycle of inequality you mentioned.   On the second argument:   * I appreciate the starting point of highlighting different kinds of teachers in the status quo. * However, in some of the comparisons, simply stating that the incentive exists for money-minded teachers is not equivalent to proving that the incentive actually works! * In most cases, your incentive exists but on a much smaller scale and it’s harder to be obtained by most teachers, i.e. the promotion is a very finite opportunity provided to only the best teachers. * So this argument is sounding defensive, without proving that you can actually co-opt the same benefits to the same extent.   + We would be better off arguing a unique and exclusive harm, such as teachers utilising perverse methods to improve the scores of their students.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  7.04 - Excellent timing. | | | | | | |