| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would establish vocational schools and aggressively stream underperforming students into them |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Excellent job phrasing the hook, good use of rhetoric and emotionally evocative phrases!   * Good job slowing down your pacing in the beginning.   On the set-up:   * Clear explanation on what vocational schools are. * We didn’t need to explain in the set-up the precise reasons why students are underperforming, something this contentious should be in the argument itself, rather in the set-up.   + Keep the set-up concise and only cover the definition, model, burden and/or framing. There’s no need to put characterisation here unless it’s foundational to the entire debate. * On the modelling, it isn’t clear if students have ANY autonomy on what kind of vocational schools they are enrolled to, and what are these standards of “underperforming.” Is it just grades?   Opp can just as easily encourage and incentivise students to voluntarily enroll into vocational schools, why was it necessary to rob them of their autonomy and entrap them into a vocation they wouldve never chosen for themselves.  On the failures of the traditional education system:   * Rather than just explaining why they underperform, we need to clearly link as to why these problems are something that can only be solved by vocational schools. I am not hearing the mechanistic analysis as to why there are INHERENT attributes of the traditional system that can never be compatible with specific TYPES of students.   + E.g. Explain that children with learning disorders do not thrive in exam-oriented settings, and would typically thrive in skills-based hands-on learning.   + E.g. Students all naturally have different types of intelligences, but traditional systems only value the STEM, logic-side of intelligences! If some students have spatial intelligence, enrolling in arts/crafts-type of vocational skills will actually match your natural aptitudes. * Good analysis that schools often do not prioritise underperforming students, but is this necessarily any different in vocational schools?   Strong analysis as to why students often spiral in a worse fashion when forced to confront their failure.   * We can expand the human costs analysis on why these environments would breed long-term impact on their personalities due to the formative years analysis. * In response to the POI, the failure is exclusive to traditional schools, why do they think they will similarly fail in vocational schools?   We’re lacking analysis as to why the new system of vocational schools is any better! We have to fully analyse what are the environments of these vocational schools before we can claim all of the better educational outcomes.   * We cannot assert that these types of jobs are stable and ensure better livelihoods, spend time characterising these professions!   + Good analysis on being able to start working immediately post-trade school. * We need to tie back this argument back to the macro of the purpose of schools!   I appreciate the attempt to weigh it against autonomy, but the execution is incomplete.   * Opp would be saying that vocational satisfaction is the preferable outcome, that they ought to be happy with the job they chose; why do you think this matters less than making money? * Conclude clearly as well that they never had any real or meaningful choices anyways in a system that is designed for them to fail! So Opp wouldn’t have been able to argue any meaningful forms of autonomy.   8.09 | | | | | | |