| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulous |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would make tertiary education free |
| --- |

| 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 to 7 minutes’ long.]  Nice job linking the right to tertiary as being a gateway to other fundamental and basic human needs, if we can spend some time here actually proving the statement it would be even better.  On the set-up:   * Clear modelling based on accessibility. * But clarity on very important aspects of the debate is still quite lacking!   + Do we still have a college admissions process that determines if some people are qualified to study to begin with? Are we prioritising access over merit in all instances?   + Are all college offerings remaining the same? What will happen to the funding and infrastructure of these colleges without the fees paid by students? * I appreciate us highlighting this as an extension of already making education free at the primary and secondary level, extend here by stating that society has evolved so much that tertiary qualifications are necessary to survive, thus we have to propose extending state subsidy here.   There’s a lot of characterisation on the competitiveness of society and proving the necessity of a college degree, this should actually be placed in the argument, not the set-up!  On the right to education is what people are entitled to:   * Aside from stating that poor people cannot afford education, we need to explain why many children are trapped in cyclical poverty precisely because they cannot access tertiary education; and social mobility can only be accessed with tertiary qualifications.   + We can be more comparative here, if the analysis is only limited to poor people, why can’t the Opp address it by only subsidising community colleges, or providing financial aid/scholarships?     - To prove that something is a right, the analysis should be universal to all people. * On social mobility, we’re still not explaining why only a college degree can break the poverty trap.   We are brushing over the impacts too quickly, what are the human costs of intergenerational poverty?   * What exactly is this vague economic benefit of everyone possessing tertiary qualifications?   After explaining that it’s a necessity for people to survive, we can expound this desperation into conning young students into taking out excessive student loans.   * Which often involves predatory practices that impose lifelong financial liabilities on students, and students can very rarely consent to that.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.57 - So close, wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |