| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 to 7 minutes’ long.]  The hook can be more impactful, Vania!   * Signpost your argument as well, instead of just 3 rebuttals.   On tertiary education being inaccessible, we need to engage with Opp’s counter-model!   * They offered targeted measures like scholarships and financial aid, so we have to explain why this is woefully inadequate in the status quo. * But I accept your conclusion that your safety net is wider.   + The question is why should accessibility be prioritised over merit?   We are not properly engaging with many of Opp’s arguments on:   * The loss of qualities in these universities due to the loss of funding, * These students are set up to fail when they enter university without any adequate merit.   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?   Good impacting on the unique economic value of everyone receiving higher education!   * We can explain what are high-skilled occupations that only be unlocked with college education, and ground the impacts in certain industries. * On unlocking specific skill sets like leadership etc, it’s unclear why the development of all of this is unique to a college experience. Why can’t they learn all of this in the workplace?   Limiting this debate to a developing country does not do you any favours because:   * These countries are short of resources and will result in precisely all of the harms that Opp accuse you of, * In developing countries, there’s a greater chance of finding economic opportunities that are not locked out by virtue of not having a college degree.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.35 - Good timing! | | | | | | |