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

| **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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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!  On the set-up:   * Clear explanation on vocational schools. * However, underperforming does not necessarily mean students with no motivation, something this contentious should be in the argument itself, rather in the set-up.   + This includes the characterisation of the lack of support they face in the education system.   + 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.”   On the failures of the traditional education system:   * It isn’t clear why the lack of interest is something that can only be solved by vocational schools. We have to analyse why specific TYPES of students can never gain any ability to thrive in these traditional systems.   + 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?   + It isn’t clear why more teacher support would have fixed the problem when it’s about mismatched learning abilities and interests.   On thriving in the new systems:   * We have to fully analyse what are the environments of these vocational schools before we can claim all the outcomes of accessing supportive student communities.   + How can we claim things like teachers will pay them more attention? Do these schools have more resources? * We cannot assert that these types of jobs are stable and ensure better livelihoods, spend time characterising these professions! * We need to tie back this argument back to the macro of the purpose of schools!   Good job offering POIs today!  8.05 | | | | | | |